

CHRISTIAN OBSERVER.

[FROM THE LONDON EDITION.]

No. 196.]

APRIL, 1818.

[No. 4. Vol. XVII.]

RELIGIOUS COMMUNICATIONS.

For the Christian Observer.

CURSORY REMARKS ON UNITARIANISM, AND THE ARGUMENTS BY WHICH IT IS USUALLY SUPPORTED.

(Continued from p. 139.)

No. IV.

HAVING in the preceding papers answered Mr. Wright's principal and more general objections to the doctrine of a Trinity of persons in the Unity of the Godhead, it is necessary that I should further meet the specific objections by which he would disprove the Deity of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: and with that view I proceed, first, to consider his mode of obviating the force of those texts in which the name of God is given to Jesus Christ. Mr. Wright observes—"It has been taken for granted that Christ is called Jehovah; but this has never been proved to be the case in a single instance: and if it could be proved, no more could be justly inferred from it, than that through him the Most High will shew himself the promise-fulfilling God: it would no more prove that he is God, than the connecting the name of Jehovah with the church, or with certain altars, proved them to be deities."

Has it not been proved that Christ is called Jehovah in the Old Testament, and by the name which corresponds to it in the New? Let, then, the English reader only bear in mind, that, wherever the word LORD is printed in capitals in our translation, the original word is Jehovah; and that, wherever it occurs in the New,

as applied to our blessed Saviour, the original word is that by which the Greeks always translated Jehovah; and then let him examine the following texts:—Jer. xxiii. 5, 6; "The days come, saith the LORD, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth. In his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely: and this is the name whereby he shall be called, The LORD our Righteousness."—Mal. iii. 1; "The LORD, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the Messenger of the Covenant, whom ye delight in."—Phil. ii. 11; "Every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."—These are a few out of the multitude of texts, in which our Lord Jesus Christ is either expressly called Jehovah, or is called by a name which was universally substituted for that name both in the Septuagint and by the writers of the New Testament. And where, I would ask, is the church, or in what part of the Scripture are any altars, called by the name Jehovah? Or what parallel can be found to that unlimited application of the name to the person of the Son, which occurs in every part of Scripture? Our author says, indeed, "Before it be concluded, from the titles of Jesus Christ, that he is more than man, it should be proved that they are not given to him as man in the Scriptures." But can it be necessary to prove, that the name JEHOVAH is not given to our Lord, as man; that the name God is not

given him *as man*; that the title, THE LORD FROM HEAVEN, is not given him *as man*? Then must it be necessary seriously to prove, that God does not mean man, or man God; and that the holy Scripture in saying one thing does not intend exactly the contrary! Far be from us such liberties with the word of truth!

But the name of God also is given to Christ as well as the name of Jehovah: and this testimony again the author evades in much the same way as he had done the other. "He may be a God by office, yet not by nature; by the appointment of the Father, yet not be absolutely supreme. The name denotes government and dominion, and the government is on the shoulder of Christ: he is constituted Lord of all." In my humble conception, however, the word God denotes much more than government and dominion. Is nothing more than dominion and government implied by the name in the following texts? Gen. xvii. 7; "I will establish my covenant between me and thee, and thy seed after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee."—Hos. xi. 9; "I will not execute the fierceness of mine anger. I will not return to destroy Ephraim: for I am God, and not man!"—Micah vii. 18; "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage?"—Matt. xix. 17; "There is none good but one; that is God."—Rom. iii. 4; "Let God be true, and every man a liar!" Indeed, so far is it from being the case that the word God does not in Scripture denote true and proper Deity, with all the perfections and attributes that belong to his character, and make up the compound idea of his holiness, that in several of the passages above quoted the application of the name to created beings is visited with the severest language of reproof and indignation.

Yet our author expressly asserts, "The word God is now used to denote true and proper Deity; but this was not always the case." And, "When applied to the Supreme Being, other terms are frequently connected with it to describe his character and perfections. He is called Jehovah God, the Most High God, the Almighty God, the only Wise God, the Invisible God, &c. titles never applied to any other being. If the term God, by itself, expressed true and proper Deity, the addition of other terms, to distinguish the Most High from all other beings would be superfluous."—Does Mr. Wright really mean, that the name God, when taken by itself and without any thing in the context to determine it otherwise, can signify any other than the Supreme Being? What becomes then of the text, "God is love," which he has often quoted, and which is indeed a fit subject for the purest gratitude and delight? Of whom is this said? Of the Supreme or of some inferior being? Or, if he would refer us rather to the Scriptures of the Old Testament for the justification of his remark, who is meant by that name in Deut. iv. 7? "What nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them as the Lord our God is in all things that we call upon him for?" Indeed, is not the name expressly and exclusively appropriated to the Most High, so as even to fix a charge of blasphemy upon the profanation of it? Isa. xlv. 8; "Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God. I know not any." Isa. xlviii. 11; "Should my name be polluted? I will not give my glory unto another." And yet the addition of epithets expressive of his unspeakable perfections is in no degree superfluous. They are sometimes used, indeed, in contradistinction to those false deities, who were too often set up to deprive him of his due honour. But they often serve only to remind

us of those high attributes which our poor conceptions may forget to ascribe to him, and often also, in the way of argument, to keep up in our recollection the warning truth, that we do not sin unseen, and can harbour no evil thoughts without discovery. These considerations, indeed, are sometimes amplified beyond the compass of a few epithets, as in Ps. xciv. 7—10; "They say, The Lord shall not see, neither shall the God of Jacob regard it." "Take heed, ye unwise among the people! O ye fools, when will ye understand? He that planted the ear, shall he not hear? or he that made the eye, shall he not see? or he that nurtureth the heathen (it is he that teacheth man knowledge,) shall not he punish?" If, therefore, the adjectives alone were superfluous, these descriptions must be much more so.

In the same way, in which the author degrades the scriptural notion of the name God to something unworthy of Godhead, he also degrades the name Word of God and Spirit of God, as the reader will immediately perceive.

"The Word and Spirit are not personal subsistences in God; but what he has been pleased to manifest and communicate to man. The Word of God seems, generally, to mean the manifestation of his character, perfections, mind, and will, whether in his visible works, by peculiar revelations, such as the prophets received, or in any other way: and Christ is called the Word of God, because by him God hath spoken to us in these last days. The Spirit of God intends the Divine operations and influence, which are perceivable throughout all his works; but in the New Testament by the Spirit is chiefly meant those extraordinary gifts and miraculous powers, which were communicated to Christ, the Apostles, and first Christians: sometimes indeed it may mean godlike tempers and dispositions. But what has all this to do with the

Word and Spirit being distinct persons in the Godhead?" Nothing, certainly, if this representation of the matter be correct. But let us bring it to the test, by substituting, in one or two instances, the definition for the thing defined. The proem to St. John's Gospel I shall have further occasion to consider. At present I will only translate the first verse of it into our author's language. It would run thus:—"In the beginning was the manifestation of the Divine character; and the manifestation of the Divine character was with God; and the manifestation of the Divine character was God;"—and a few verses after; "The manifestation of the Divine character was made flesh." It is generally understood, indeed, that The Word is the same in this passage with The Son in others. Let us consider, then, according to this doctrine, what will become of the baptismal form if our author's interpretation be taken of it. The Apostles are commanded to baptize in the name of God, and of the manifestation of his character, and of the extraordinary gifts vouchsafed in the first ages of Christianity. Nay, we have these extraordinary gifts, in Rom. viii. 26, making intercession for us. We are directed not to grieve these extraordinary gifts, (Eph. iv. 30), and are told that they were seen descending like a dove (Matt. iii. 16), and resting upon our blessed Saviour.

Our author, indeed, escapes from some of these applications of his exposition, by admitting that the Word and Spirit are sometimes personified. Nothing is easier in general than to distinguish a personification in any clear writer from a plain description. The personification of Wisdom in the Proverbs and Book of Job has misled no one. But I can see nothing like this in any of the descriptions of the Word and Spirit in either Testament; nor has the author pointed out any such instances. Till this is done, there can be neither force

nor appropriateness of application in his remark.

In reference to Mr. Wright's remark on the title "Word of God," as applied to our blessed Saviour, I readily grant to the author, that this title, simply considered, by no means proves that Christ was more than man. But, though the title *by itself* will not prove this, the declaration of St. John, that the Word was God, will prove it fully : and in whatever sense, or for whatever reason the title was ascribed to him, it is given to him as a partaker of both natures : for it is written, "The word was God ; and the Word was made flesh."

The next title to be noticed is "the Lord from heaven ;" on which the author says, "This title is given to Christ simply as man ; for Paul says, The second man is the Lord from Heaven : therefore it cannot imply that he is more than man, only that he received his dignity immediately from God."

I cannot easily conceive a greater solecism in reasoning than for the strongest expression, that could well be used to shew that Christ was more than man, to be thus construed into a declaration of the contrary. Yet I agree that it cannot *imply* this doctrine ; for it *asserts* it ; and the words of our Lord himself are the best commentary upon it. "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." (John iii. 13.)

The same kind of argument is repeated on the title, "the Son of God." "This title is given to Christ as the Son of man, Matt. xvi. 13, 16 : therefore cannot prove that he is any other than a human being." Yet what sense does the author understand to be conveyed in the confession of St. Peter, to which he alludes in his reference to St. Matthew ? According to him, this means no more than, "Thou, the Son of Man, art the son of man." But if as son of man he

was a human person, and as Son of God, a Divine one, there is meaning in the confession, and the testimony is sufficiently important to account for the following answer : "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona ; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven." (ver. 17.) To this it is replied, that "if the name, Son of God, meant the union of the human and Divine natures in the person to whom it is given, this must be its meaning when applied to other persons as well as to Jesus, to his followers, who are called Sons of God." The inference, however, is not quite correct ; because he is distinguished from all other persons to whom that name is given, by being called the only begotten Son of God. I by no means design in this observation to affirm, that the name, as applied to Christ, means the union of the Divine and human natures, but only to deny the inference thus deduced from that union. That as applied to Christ, it included his Deity, I venture to affirm on the authority of his own words (John v. 21) ; "As the Father raiseth up the dead and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will : what things soever he doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise." I am supported in this opinion by the sense in which the Jews, who heard him, understood his pretensions. John v. 18 : "The Jews sought to kill him, because he said that God was his Father, making himself equal with God." I am farther strengthened in it by the uncontradicted inference of the high priest, from his assumption of that title in Matt. xxvi. 63-65 : "The high priest answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us, whether thou be the Christ the Son of God. Jesus said unto him, Thou hast said. Nevertheless, I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the Son of Man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the

clouds of heaven. Then the high priest rent his clothes, saying, He hath spoken blasphemy."

The argument, therefore, that he who is the Son of God, must himself be God, does not apply to those who are sons of God by adoption, as the Father is said to have predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ to himself (Eph. i. 5); or to those who are sons of God by creation, as it is written, "The morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy;" but only to Him who is emphatically distinguished from them all, as the only begotten Son of God, nor even to him simply on account even of that peculiar designation, but in respect of the high claims with which his assumption of it is accompanied. Thus, to refer to a passage lately quoted, to do the same works which the Father doeth, and to do them according to his own will and pleasure are attributes too high for a creature, and therefore never assumed by any creature without blasphemy. The peculiar manner and circumstances, in which our Lord called himself Son of God, were such as to lead the Jews, who yet said of themselves, "We have one Father, even God," to accuse him of blasphemy for saying, "I am the Son of God." (John x. 36.) Their testimony is therefore in favour of that peculiarity in his claim of Sonship, for which I contend.

It need only be observed further, that our Lord calls God his Father in a sense that is plainly peculiar to himself. Hence he always says, "my Father," or "the Father," where others say "God." Moreover he does not allow to others the privilege of calling God their Father, unless they did the works communicated by God. John viii. 42; "If God were your Father, ye would love me:" whereas, on the other hand, he himself not only did the works which the Father commanded, but the works which the Father does. (John v. 19.)

And, again, "My Father worketh hitherto and I work." (John v. 17.)

The term, "only-begotten," is applied to Christ exclusively, to distinguish him from all other beings. They, it is true, are in some sense the children of God. But he is "the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father." (John i. 18.) In what mysterious sense this term is applied to him concerns us not. It is sufficient to perceive, that it is a distinguishing title of the Lord our Saviour, who alone is essentially begotten of the Father.

To all these reasonings on the names of Deity which are given to Christ in Scripture, the author replies, that Moses and the Judges of Israel are called gods likewise. To establish the parallelism in these instances, it should be shewn that Moses and the Judges of Israel are called gods in the same way, and under the same circumstances, as Christ is. Let us examine, then, the texts which are cited in proof of this alleged similarity.

The first passage is Exod. vii. 1; "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh." Now, surely, no man in his senses could imagine that this passage ascribed proper Deity to Moses, but only in his relation to Pharaoh, and that too for a particular purpose. The particle "to," expressive of relation, excludes the positive idea altogether; and it would be as natural to suppose, that the king's house of Judah was the land of Gilead, because it is said (Jer. xxii. 6.), "Thou art Gilead to me," as to believe Moses to be a god, because it is said, "I have made thee a god to Pharaoh."

The next passage cited is Psal. lxxxii. 6; "I have said, Ye are gods, and all of you are children of the Most High;" a testimony, the whole force of which is taken away by the words which follow. (ver. 7.) "But ye shall die, like men, and fall like one of the princes." The sentence.

taken in the connexion in which it stands, amounts to a strong description of the glory to which wicked men may be for a time exalted; so as even to seem like gods, and be accounted the children of the Most High, although they must soon die, like men, and fall like one of the princes who have fallen before them: nor can we imagine that any one even for a moment supposed that proper Deity was ascribed to any persons of whom it is immediately affirmed, "Ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes." Compare with this Ezek. xxviii. 9; "Wilt thou yet say before him that slayeth thee, I am God? But thou shalt be a man and no god in the hand of him that slayeth thee." The plain and natural meaning of the passage from the Psalm in question, as it would strike any casual reader, is, "I once was inclined to look upon you as gods, the children of God; so great was your glory and prosperity." So David says in Psal. xxx. 6; "I said in my prosperity, I shall never be moved;" and in Psal. cxvi. 11; "I said in my haste, All men are liars." "But that delusion will soon pass away: for ye shall die like men, and fall like one of the princes." Indeed it would be impossible, it would be impious, to suppose, that the persons here meant were intended to be described as real gods, or even as children of God, in any scriptural sense of that term, after the account which had been given of them just before. Ver. 2. 5; "How long will ye judge unjustly, and accept the persons of the wicked? They know not, neither will they understand. They walk on in darkness." The whole Psalm is apparently a song of encouragement to the oppressed saints, perhaps under Saul's government; designed to convince them, that the reign of iniquity would be short, that God should judge the judges, and was higher than the princes of the earth. Ver. 1. 2; "God

standeth in the congregation of the mighty. He judgeth among the Gods. Arise, O God! Judge the earth! For thou shalt inherit all nations." But none of these remarks apply to the name of God, whenever it is given to our blessed Saviour. Indeed I feel persuaded from a comparison of the last verse of the Psalm with Psal. ii. 8, and other places, that the God who is here described as judging among the pretended gods of the earth, and destined finally to inherit all nations, is no other person than our blessed Saviour himself, the Son of the Father; to whom we shall find as we go on, that the name, God, is repeatedly applied both in the Old and New Testament without any such qualifying or explanatory accompaniment as that by which the phrase, "I have said, Ye are gods," is surrounded on all sides in this Psalm. Nevertheless, this is a favourite text with the author; and the perpetual repetition of it betrays the weakness of the cause which it is adduced to support.

These remarks are also applicable to the only remaining passage cited (John x. 35), which is, in fact, only a quotation of the same place on which I have just remarked. But are these solitary phrases, the sense of which is obvious and undisputed, to be compared with the long stream of testimony, which is brought for the Deity of Christ? "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God." (Isa. ix. 6.)—"They shall call his name Immanuel, which, being interpreted, is God with us." (Matt. i. 23.)—"The word was God." (John i. 1.)—"Thomas answered and said, My Lord and my God!" (John xx. 28.)—"Christ came, who is over all, God, blessed for ever." (Rom. ix. 5.)—"Christ Jesus, 'being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.'" (Phil. ii. 6.)—To these texts none of the foregoing remarks can apply. They are plain;

* So
confor
that th
think
it, as C

direct, unequivocal, and bear with their whole force, without any abatement, upon the question in hand; nor can I see any reason to qualify them.

(To be continued.)

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I WAS much struck lately, in reading Quinctilian's Institution of an Orator, in meeting unexpectedly with the following sentence:—"Et est conditoribus urbium infame, contraxisse aliquam perniciosam ceteris gentem qualis est firimus Judaica superstitionis auctor." ("It is a reproach to the founders of cities, to have drawn together some tribe of men, who should prove mischievous to the rest of the world, as was the case with the originator of the Jewish superstition.") It occurs (lib. iii. § 7), where the author is pointing out the proper topics for laudatory or invective orations. It is introduced quite incidentally, among other instances of persons whose deeds have entailed infamy on their names; and thus shews, in the strongest possible light, the contempt associated with the name of Moses in the mind, and among the countrymen, of the author.*

How striking is it to compare with such a passage, the fact which has been thus forcibly stated by a celebrated author:—"It has been by means of this one despised nation (for Jesus the Founder of the Christian Religion was of it), that the knowledge of the one true God has been preserved and propagated in the world to this very day. All nations that have not been, directly or indirectly, taught by them, are at this day idolaters."

That the nations should thus receive their religion from the despised Jews, is well known to have been

* Some suppose that the *Jewish* is here confounded with the *Christian* name, and that the blessed Jesus is intended: but I think it much more natural to understand it, as Gesner does, of Moses.

a subject of constant prediction. As Mr. Scott observes (Sermon on Zech. viii. 23), "Who could have imagined that these Romans especially would have become disciples to the Jews in the grand concern of religion?" This, however, is predicted in the text. *In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold, out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you; for we have heard that God is with you.*—The conquerors and destroyers of the Jews have become the worshippers of the God of the Jews. Jehovah has superseded Jupiter, and all the other pagan deities, through the vast dominions of the Greeks and Romans; not to dwell on the utter extinction of the ancient idolatry of Chaldea, Persia, and Egypt. *The Lord hath furnished all the gods of the earth; and men worship him, every one from his place, even all the isles of the heathen.* (Zeph. ii. 11.) I cannot but add, that what has been done should greatly raise our hopes as to what shall be done in future.

J. S.—H.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

I HAVE received much pleasure from the attempts which have been lately made by Mr. Cooper, in his excellent volume of Letters, as well as in your Review of that work, and by your correspondent *INGENUUS*, to conciliate those pious persons, who, agreeing in the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, still maintain some degree of hostility as Calvinists and Arminians. That the Christians who choose to adopt these titles of distinction, should be brought to a uniformity of sentiment, respecting those doctrines on which they now differ, is not to be expected. But that the animosity, which has been too often excited by their difference, may be abated, or entirely removed, is not

beyond the bounds of probability, where a moderate degree of Christian candour possesses the heart of each.

Your correspondent Ingenuus having invited any friend of the Christian Observer to point out terms of amity, that are "fair, easy, and practicable," I shall beg leave to offer a view of the subject which has completely tranquilized my own mind, and which may tend to produce the same happy effect upon the minds of others.

The relief I have obtained with respect to the discordancy that appears in many passages of Scripture has been obtained, by considering the Bible in its doctrinal, no less than its preceptive part, as a PRACTICAL BOOK, and claiming for every doctrine it contains a corresponding state of heart and conduct in the receiver of that doctrine. And if we diligently attend to the instruction which each passage conveys, we shall find that those parts of Scripture which appear irreconcilable in theory, are yet perfectly reconcilable with respect to the practical effect which they are designed to produce, upon our minds. Though often set in hostile array against each other by controversial combatants, it will not be denied by either party that an obedient regard to both becomes necessary to constitute the Christian character.

The Scriptures abound with passages which represent religion as the effect of a Divine agency upon the heart; yet at the same time command us to "*cleanse ourselves* from all filthiness of flesh and spirit." An exclusive attention to either of these representations, would produce in us erroneous sentiments as to doctrine, and defective conduct respecting our practice. Yet, as both are taught by the same authority, they have an equal claim upon our attention. Passages of the former kind teach us our depraved condition by nature,

and urge us to implore the sanctifying influences of the Holy Spirit, to renew our hearts in righteousness, and to strengthen every holy desire already wrought in us. They teach us also to give all the glory to God, for those holy desires or tempers of which we are conscious; and considering ourselves as mere recipients of his bounty, to arrogate nothing that is good to ourselves; while passages of the latter kind tend to produce a holy shame, and deep remorse for the unholiness which yet remains in our hearts, and for which we are considered to be strictly responsible.

The sacred writers see no opposition in those passages which persons engaged in angry controversy on the subjects now under consideration have produced against each other: and whosoever seeks for the practical directions which the respective passages convey, will perceive that his religion would be defective, if either series of texts were suffered to produce a neglect of the others.

Work out your own salvation, says the Apostle, *with fear and trembling: for it is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of his good pleasure.* (Phil. ii. 12, 13.) How beautifully is the Christian character described in the two distinct parts of this passage! The true believer in Christ labours with the most serious concern, to avoid every thing that would endanger his salvation, and to perform every act of obedience with the same care that would be required if salvation were attainable merely by his own efforts; while at the same time he is conscious of his utter inability to maintain even a good thought, without the sanctifying operation of the Holy Spirit; and continually approaches the Throne of Grace, that he may be enabled to do those things which God has commanded.

When our Saviour says, John vi. 37; *All that the Father giveth me shall come to me*; or, as it is expressed in ver. 44, *No man can*

come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him; and adds (ver. 37), *And him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.* How forcibly are we urged to supplicate those influences of the Holy Spirit, which, though absolutely necessary to our coming to the Redeemer, are represented as flowing only from the sovereign good pleasure of God; while at the same time all doubt is removed of a favourable reception, which there is no secret decree to prevent, if we truly come to Christ as the only Mediator betwixt God and man!

If difficulties remain in the Scriptures, as is certainly the case, they remain as tests of our humility and demonstrations of our sincerity, whilst we pay a strict regard to all that is plainly revealed.

God hath declared in his holy word, that *He will have all men to be saved, and to come to the knowledge of the truth* (1 Tim. ii. 4;) and also that *there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ.* (Acts iv. 12.) Yet He hath not as yet seen fit to make this name known to all men. Millions of our fellow-creatures, to whom he *could* have sent the glad tidings of salvation as well as to us, have never heard of this saving name. Instead, then, of attempting to reconcile these apparently discordant passages of Scripture, we are constrained to cry out with the holy Apostle, *How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!* (Rom. xi. 33.) These passages, however, convey to us most important instruction. They not only assure us of the good pleasure of God towards all who seek his favour in the way He has appointed; but call upon us to act as “workers together with him,” in seeking the salvation of all men by every method in our power; and especially by communicating the Gospel of Christ to those

Christ. Observ. No. 196.

who are sitting in darkness and the shadow of death. The Scriptures assure us, as has been already observed, that it is God alone who can renew our hearts in righteousness, since it is He who worketh in us to *will*, as well as to *do*, of his good pleasure; so that if we are saved, our salvation must be ascribed to his free grace, and sovereign good pleasure, *according as he hath chosen us in Christ, before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy, and without blame before him in love; having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will.* (Ephes. i. 4, 5.)—Yet his predetermination of any event does in no wise lessen our obligation to promote it, if it be agreeable to his revealed will; nor diminish the wickedness of those who, in bringing that event to pass, transgress his moral commandments. Jesus Christ was delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, to be offered as an atoning sacrifice for our sins; nevertheless, it was by *wicked hands* that he was crucified and slain. (Acts ii. 23.)—The Jews and Gentiles conspired to destroy this *anointed* of God; and in so doing were guilty of the greatest crime that ever was committed; yet in this they fulfilled what the *counsel* of God had *determined before to be done.* (Acts iv. 28.)

How totally inexplicable are these mysteries in the providential government of God! yet they convey to us *practical instruction* of high importance. From them we learn the over-ruling power of the Almighty in every event. We are taught to consider our salvation as a work of free grace and mercy, yet without any excuse being afforded for our depravity and disobedience, which are wholly self-derived.

The purport of a passage may be obvious, while some of the clauses

which it contains are of difficult interpretation. The Calvinist and Arminian will annex a different meaning to the separate phrases in that awful caution against going back into sin, contained in Heb. vi. 4—6: *For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come; if they shall fall away, to renew them again to repentance, &c.* Yet no one can doubt the general purport of the passage, as designed to guard us against the least approach to apostacy: and if we make this use of the caution, we need not be greatly distressed because we cannot satisfy ourselves about the exact meaning of its separate clauses.

St. Paul, in the eighth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans, expresses in strong language his persuasion of the final perseverance of God's elect; yet, in 1 Cor. ix. 27, he informs us of the great caution which he himself used to *keep under his body, and bring it into subjection, lest by any means when he had preached to others, he himself should be a cast-away.*

These passages are brought forward, by the Calvinist and Arminian, as proofs of the truth of their respective tenets: and there is doubtless some difficulty in reconciling them as applied to the opposing systems. But considered with regard to their practical effect, the opposition vanishes. The humble and cautious believer embraces both with equal regard, and finds no difficulty in their union. He cannot maintain too strong a confidence of his final perseverance, if that confidence does not diminish his fear of relapsing. Nor can his fear of relapsing be too great, if it does not diminish his confident hope of future glory.

If the pious Calvinist and Arminian

would more confine their views to the practical instruction which every passage of Scripture is intended to convey, they would find a nearer approach to concord in their respective systems, than controversy has led them to expect. Experience happily proves the truth of this observation. I have often had much satisfaction in witnessing the harmony of religious persons of different sentiments respecting the Calvinistic controversy, when conversing on personal and practical religion; and when all idea of controversy was laid aside. And I am fully persuaded, that discord would give place to harmony in a very great degree, if personal and practical instruction were the grand object proposed to ourselves in our study of the Bible.

These observations might be carried on to a much greater extent: but enough has been said, I apprehend, to shew what I mean by considering the Bible as a *practical book*, and to point out the way in which Calvinists and Arminians may unite without any dereliction of their peculiar sentiments. Only let every passage of Scripture be regarded as teaching us individually what we are to be and to do, leaving the secret counsels of God towards others out of the question, and terms of amity will be afforded, which are "fair, easy, and practicable." Angry contentions amongst those who hold the fundamental doctrines of Scripture, will cease; and the faithful followers of the Redeemer will harmoniously join in the holy strife of shewing forth, by the obedience of their lives, their gratitude to Him who hath "loved them, and washed them from their sins in his own blood," and who will finally bring them to his heavenly kingdom, where, as kings and priests, they shall reign with him for ever and ever. W. H.

FAMILY SERMONS.—No. CXII.

1 Pet. ii. 21.—*Christ suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps.*

OUR Saviour is represented to us throughout Scripture in a two-fold aspect; namely, to use the words of the Church, as a *sacrifice for sin*, and also an *ensample of godly life**. Practically to unite these two, constitutes the purity of Christian doctrine, and the excellence of the Christian life. To view the Redeemer as our Sacrifice, without endeavouring to imitate his Example, would lead to a false and unholy security; while to view him only as a Pattern for our imitation, without remembering that he is also the sacrifice for our sins, the High Priest that can be touched with the feeling of our infirmities, the merciful Redeemer that ever liveth to make intercession for us, would naturally incline us either to self-sufficiency and spiritual pride on the one hand, or, on the other, to terror, and apprehension, and despair. Let us endeavour, by the blessing of God, to unite the two, while we contemplate the great High Priest of our profession,

I. As our Sacrifice.

II. As our Example.

FIRST, then, let us view the Redeemer AS OUR SACRIFICE; the great Sin-offering that was to atone for our transgressions. To contemplate him only as a pattern of righteousness, is infinitely too little. He left the right hand of the Majesty on high, he assumed our nature, he wept, and suffered, and expired, not only to rectify sinful man, by his example, but also to redeem him by his blood. He was a Prophet; but he was also more than a prophet; he was a High Priest, to make upon the cross, by his one oblation of himself, once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice and satisfaction for

the sins of the whole world. He is the pattern for our conduct; but he is also the propitiation for our sins.

The text briefly points out two most important circumstances, connected with the sacrifice of Christ;—first, that *he suffered*; and, secondly, that his sufferings were *for us*.

1. *He suffered*.—Trace his progress from the manger to the cross, and see if ever there were sorrow like unto his sorrow. Without respite or intermission, he travelled on through life in the path of care, and anxiety, and affliction. In his very infancy he was despised and rejected of the Bethlehemites, and his life was sought by Herod. He was afterwards tempted by Satan, subjected to hunger and thirst, and was without a place where to lay his head. At length he was sold by one who called himself a friend and disciple: he was apprehended, arraigned, scourged, and condemned. To conclude the whole, he was led as an out-cast from society without the walls of the city, to expire upon the ignominious cross, in company with two malefactors.

The sufferings of his soul were, doubtless, even greater than those of his body. It is said in the Gospel, *his soul was heavy*. He endured the contradiction of sinners. He beheld men wilfully rejecting his salvation, and persecuting the Lord of life and glory. His very miracles he heard attributed to the agency of Satan, and his holy doctrines condemned as blasphemy against God. Often was he “grieved at the hardness of the peoples’ heart.” As righteous Lot was vexed at the filthy conversation of the wicked, so—but in infinitely higher proportion—was the Redeemer wounded through his whole life, by the sins, the rebellion, the ingratitude of mankind, and even of his disciples themselves.

But who shall attempt to describe the agonies he endured? Who shall tell the awful import of those words,

* Collect for Second Sunday after Easter

his soul was made an offering for sin? As the blessings which he lived and died to purchase were such as eye had not seen, nor ear heard, and which it had not entered into the heart of man to conceive, so also was the suffering which procured them. His soul became exceeding sorrowful even unto death. Thrice he entreated his Father, *if it be possible, let this cup pass from me*. At the extremity of his affliction an angel descended to support him, for he appeared ready to sink beneath the weight of sorrows that were laid upon him. Even his heavenly Father seemed to forsake him; and what that part of his sufferings must have been, no created being can conceive. If the presence and favour of God, even in the comparatively small measure in which they are exhibited upon earth, could support the Apostles in every possible affliction, and make martyrs at the stake express a joy unspeakable and full of glory, how unutterable must be that blessedness which our Lord himself had shared from eternity with his Father; and consequently how immeasurable must have been the extent of his sufferings, when he felt, for the first time, that bitter desertion which caused him to exclaim, *My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me!* He uttered no complaint in the other part of his agonies; the scoffs and taunts of men, the tortures of the body, the insincerity of professed friends, the thorns, the scourge, the cross, were nothing compared with the desertion of Him, whose presence is fulness of joy, and whose displeasure, even in mitigated anger, and but for a moment, is the deepest woe that man or angel can endure.

2. But why this scene of desertion and distress? Why did the Lord of heaven and earth thus condescend to take upon him the form of a servant, and to be made in the likeness of man, and, being found in fashion as a man,

to humble himself, and to submit to death, even the death of the cross? Why this exchange of life for death, of joy for sorrow, of the crown of heaven for the cross of Calvary? He suffered *for us*. He loved us, and therefore gave himself for us. No man took his life from him; but he willingly laid it down for our salvation. He could, in the midst of his anguish, have prayed to his Father, who would have sent him more than ten legions of angels; yet he submitted to the dispensation—he willingly completed the work that was given him to do. He was even straitened till it was accomplished. He voluntarily made his soul an offering for sin, and that in order that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.

This way, in which our salvation was accomplished, besides being fraught with the greatest benefits to mankind, was well suited to display the wisdom, and love, and justice of God. Justice might, indeed, have inflicted punishment upon us without a remedy; and Mercy might, perhaps, have freely pardoned the offender without satisfaction; but who can propose any other way than that actually adopted, by which *mercy and truth might meet together, righteousness and peace might kiss each other?* The reason of this is evident; for by nature we were children of wrath—we were enemies in our mind to God by wicked works. Banishment from the Divine presence, with eternal punishment of soul and body, was our just portion. In this state, salvation, if conferred at all, must necessarily be a free gift; not of works but of grace. For who shall dare to challenge reward? Who can see in his past conduct, or anticipate in his future, any thing but what must add to his demerits, instead of purchasing his pardon? Dead in trespasses and sins, man, by nature, is incapable of saving him-

181
self
if h
with
the
awa
till
for
U
Red
that
mig
suffe
suffe
acce
dom
lieve
beco
we h
privi
ings
etern
havin
not a
thing
Th
as ou
Did h
hell,
heave
that
them
from
pressl
death
oursel
us and
St. Pe
imme
us, tha
own bo
being
righte
holy a
best di
motive
the Re
Seco
From a
tion of
person
formed
God, an
who lo

self if he were willing, and unwilling if he were able. He is contented with his unhappy lot, and, but for the mercy of God, would not even awake to a sense of his condition, till the time for remedying it was for ever past.

Under these circumstances, the Redeemer said, *Lo I come*. He came that we might have life, and that we might have it more abundantly. He suffered for us, that we might not suffer eternally. The sacrifice was accepted; and henceforth the kingdom of heaven is opened to all believers. By faith in this Sacrifice we become justified, and being justified we have peace with God. All the privileges of the Gospel, all the blessings of time, all the beatitude of eternity thus become ours; for God having given his Son for us, will he not also with him freely give us all things?

Thus have we contemplated Christ as our Sacrifice.—But is this all? Did he die only to deliver us from hell, without making us meet for heaven? Did he expiate our sins that we might continue to live in them? God forbid! The farthest from it possible: he died for us expressly that we who live through his death should not henceforth live to ourselves, but unto him that loved us and gave himself for us. Indeed, St. Peter, in the words that almost immediately succeed the text, teaches us, that Christ *bare our sins in his own body on the tree, in order that we, being dead to sin, might live unto righteousness*. To this end his own holy and spotless life is at once the best direction and the most powerful motive. Let us, then, contemplate the Redeemer,

SECONDLY, AS OUR EXAMPLE.—From a sense of guilt, and a conviction of the consequences of sin, many persons have a confused and half-formed desire to be justified before God, and to have their sins pardoned, who look no farther; but hope for

these blessings while they live the life and die the death of the world. They have no adequate idea of the necessity and nature of repentance, of true conversion of heart, and progress in holiness, as well as a mere general belief in the mercy of God exhibited in a Redeemer. This fatal error arises in part from not practically viewing our blessed Lord in the second aspect under consideration; or, at least, may be best checked by such a view. The object of Christ in the great work which we have considered, was to frame from a guilty and sinful race a new and holy generation that might live to his praise and glory upon earth, and circle his throne, rejoicing in eternal holiness in heaven. To complete this stupendous scheme of mercy, he not only purchased eternal blessedness for us, but marked by his own footsteps every part of the road that leads to its enjoyment. He left us an example that we should walk in his steps.

There is a point of view in which this consideration appears peculiarly awful. For nothing is more certain than that a very large part of the world do *not* follow, or wish to follow, in the path which the Redeemer trod, and consequently have no scriptural reason to expect that they shall arrive whither he is gone. There is unspeakable comfort in the death of Christ, but it is to those only who have practically learned from his death themselves to die to sin and to live unto righteousness. This circle shuts out the impenitent world. It excludes not only the grossly profane, but the hypocrite, the pharisee, and even the careless inconsistent professor of religion. It contains those only who are so impressed with the love of the Saviour in suffering for them as to desire in return to have his image ever before their eyes as the holy model of their imitation, as well as the source of all their hopes. The Apostle, in the chapter

preceding that from which the text is taken, speaks of Christians as *redeemed from their vain conversation*. Let us not, then, delude ourselves. If we find the love of sin and the example of sinners deliberately stronger in our hearts than the love and example of the Saviour, we have, as yet, no true proof of our interest in his merits; we cannot have entered with genuine gratitude and affection into the great subject of his cross and passion, or have felt that love which constrained the holy Apostles to tread in the blessed footsteps of their Divine Lord.

The Christian is bound by his sacred profession to aim high. It is true he may not, and indeed he cannot, in this life, attain perfection; yet his *wish* and *effort*, in humble trust upon the grace and Spirit of God, will be, to be perfect even as his Father in heaven is perfect. The life of Christ, with the exception of the miraculous parts, or those which respected his peculiar work and offices, will furnish a constant exemplar of every grace and virtue in which the believer is commanded to abound. And as example is usually more influential than precept, it becomes of high importance to make this bright Pattern the daily object of our reverential regard.

And what part is there of our Lord's conduct which does not furnish us with practical instruction? Behold his prayerfulness, his early and ardent devotion of spirit, and his submission in every thing to the will of his heavenly Father. Imitate, also, his constant zeal in the things of eternity; his diligent redeeming of time; his kindness towards his friends, his forbearance towards his enemies, his unwearied services for both. Observe that prudence and discretion which marked his whole conduct, and either prevented his good being evil spoken of, or at least made the malice of the evil tongue fall harmless to the ground. Go on

to emulate that heavenly-mindedness, that deadness to the pomps, and vanities, and evil customs of the world, which marked his whole conduct. Forget not his benevolence and disinterestedness of character; his uniform love for the souls and bodies of men; his humility and condescension; his meekness and clemency; his patience and compassion, and all the long catalogue of holy graces which were conspicuous throughout his life.

To see more accurately the perfection of our Lord's character as an Example, we might proceed to mark the signal *union* of the eminent qualities which have been enumerated. All the virtues of the Saviour were intimately blended. He did not take up a few detached doctrines, or a few favourite graces, to the exclusion or disparagement of others. He united in his own person all that was good and all that was endearing; all that was just and all that was merciful; all that attracted friendship and all that secured esteem.—It is this general union of excellences which particularly demands the imitation of the Christian, in order that he may not take a narrow and contracted view of his duties and obligations; that he may not indulge any sin under the garb of a virtue, and that, in avoiding one fault, he may not revert to the opposite; a propensity to do which, the experience of every watchful Christian will bear witness, is but too ready to occur.

The particular part, however, of our Lord's example, which the text more especially exhibits for imitation, is his patience under suffering. St. Peter was addressing religious servants who were subjected to persecution for conscience' sake. With eminent propriety he points them to Him who *suffered for us, leaving us an example that we should follow his steps*. The allusion, however, extends far beyond the particular case of those to whom the words were more

1818
imm
Chri
both
his a
tles
ven
the c
us, t
that
They
and e
But
exam
more
ever
add n
to ch
life;
we s
throu
himse
under
Holy
fectua
ing to
ample
The
ample
very e
of his
der t
afflict
estate
great
Yet h
tience
spirit
escape
Father
done!
ample
thus h
sess o
duty a
follow
life.
that w
that if
awhile
with hi

immediately addressed : for every Christian is called to suffer, and needs both an Example and a Comforter in his afflictions. Our Lord and his Apostles do not tell us that the path to heaven is free from fears and sorrows ; on the contrary, they repeatedly inform us, that it is *through much tribulation that we must enter the kingdom of God*. They boldly reveal every difficulty and every discouraging circumstance. But then, in return, they point to the example of Him who bore infinitely more on our account than we can ever be called upon to endure ; they add numerous promises and blessings to cheer us in all the struggles of life ; and they teach us, that at length we shall be *more than conquerors through him that loved us and gave himself for us*. Such considerations, under the powerful influences of the Holy Spirit, will become the most effectual assistances to us, in conforming to the will, and following the example, of our blessed Redeemer.

The perfection of our Lord's example, as our pattern in affliction, is very evident, both from the *greatness* of his sufferings and his *patience* under them. Whatever may be our afflictions, either in mind, body, or estate, they are not and cannot be so great as those of our Divine Master. Yet how unconquerable was his patience ! how calm and uniform his spirit of resignation ! No murmur escaped his lips. His prayer was, *Father, not my will but thine be done !* And thus he left us an example that we should follow his steps ; thus he taught us in patience to possess our souls, and, both by active duty and submissive resignation, to follow him in the path of everlasting life. Let, then, the mind be in us that was in Christ Jesus, knowing that if we follow him, and suffer awhile with him here, we shall reign with him for ever hereafter.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE dispute concerning the story of Naaman is one of those in which I think no advantage is likely to be gained by a departure from the common translation, or the ordinary scheme of interpretation. The question, whether any individual is a truly converted character, must, in most cases, be referred to God alone. But as far as evidence can determine it, the good confession of Naaman appears to be very decisive in his favour. It was surely no light thing for an idolator to renounce his idols, and acknowledge that there was no God in all the earth, but in Israel. He might have offered to associate the worship of Jehovah with the worship of idols ; and this would seem to have been his natural course, had he remained what he once was. It was the course adopted by the Roman senate in the commencement of Christianity, while it still cherished its love of idolatry. But instead of this what does he say ? "Thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto the Lord." Is not this evidence equal to that of the Ethiopian, when he said, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God ?" That the confession of this new proselyte was accompanied by much ignorance and some weakness, ought to be no matter of surprise to those who themselves also have this treasure in earthen vessels. But, if any persons conceive the degree of this ignorance and infirmity to be inconsistent with the idea of his conversion, I would submit the following statement of the particulars to their calm consideration.

Naaman had before been a worshipper of Rimmon, and an enemy to Israel. But now he disowns the idol, and acknowledges the true God ; and such is his reverence for the land of Israel, that he requests permission to carry away two mules,

burden of earth from that favoured country, that he might be able to raise an altar from the earth, which was sanctified by the presence of the Lord of hosts, to the God of Israel; and this is the language in which the new proselyte witnesses his good confession; "Thy servant will henceforth offer neither burnt-offering nor sacrifice unto other gods, but unto the Lord."

So far, then, the evidence of his character being changed is clear, unequivocal, and complete. He declares his conviction and avows his faith openly in the presence of his officers and all his company, as well as of the man of God; and he plainly declares, in the midst of them, his resolution to offer no sacrifice in future to the gods of his own country or of any other, but only to Jehovah. His duty, as far as it had been yet revealed to him, did not seem to require him to go farther; and, therefore, we are not to wonder at the proposal of building a separate altar, though forbidden in the law, or at the request, which follows, though in one who had been educated in the Jewish Scriptures it could not have been tolerated. "In this thing the Lord pardon thy servant, that, when my master goeth unto the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaneth on my hand, and I bow myself in the house of Rimmon: when I bow down myself in the house of Rimmon, the Lord pardon thy servant in this thing!" The request betokened a remainder of infirmity, which, in so young a convert, who had not been commanded to resign his high employments and distinctions under the king of Syria, is not surprising; and, therefore, without entering into the merits of that request, the Prophet, with the indulgence of one who did not expect every effect to be wrought at once in his followers, or attempt to put new wine at once into old bottles, only says to him, "Go in peace!" He went, therefore, a changed man

in all respects, neither a leper in body, nor an idolator in heart, but carrying into his own land the knowledge of the true God, together with visible evidence of his goodness and power.

Such are my views of this interesting narrative; whether wrong or right, I leave others to decide—But I cannot, in concluding these remarks, refrain from noticing the practical lesson which the whole story, as related in the Scriptures, seems designed to inculcate;—namely, that, when once a command has been plainly given by God, we are not at liberty to stay, inquiring, what is the use of it, or how it can conduce to the end in view—which objections would prove only an evil heart of unbelief in the objectors—but must obey the command, and leave the effect to God. Our hardest commands are, in an ordinary way, but as the direction to Naaman—"Wash, and be clean!"—and he who made the waters of Jordan effectual for his recovery, will much more make the blood of Christ effectual for the justification of all who come to him by faith in a right spirit. May, therefore, He who disposed the heart of Naaman to his service, and who sent first a captive maid from the land of Israel, then his own prophet Elisha, and, lastly, a Syrian servant, for his conversion, open our hearts also, that we may attend to those things, which are spoken to us in his word, and punctually observe all the directions of his Gospel.

C. C.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

A CORRESPONDENT, in your Number for February, charges the Dean of Chester, in his Sermon prefixed to the last Annual Report of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, with misrepresenting a sentiment of Hooker's. I shall

not stop to remark on the manner in which the Dean is represented as passing judgment on what has been called *the religion of the heart*; though he has used no such expression, and has taken pains to guard against such misunderstanding of his meaning. I will proceed, without delay, to the direct charge of misrepresentation. Your correspondent has furnished the context of the passage quoted by the Dean: it is, I conceive, exactly fitted to shew that the latter has rightly understood, whilst the former has entirely misapprehended, Hooker's meaning. It is true, that the admirable author of the Ecclesiastical Polity, in the place whence the quotation is taken, is arguing against those opposers of ecclesiastical discipline who maintain, that Scripture is to be consulted to the entire exclusion of reason in religious matters. But what is the method of proof he uses against these persons? Surely this: That, whereas spiritual influence universally is a thing secret and undiscernible, we are dependent on the aid of reason, to make out, even to our own satisfaction, that we are really led by the Spirit; much more are we dependent on the same aid in order to enable us to persuade or convince others. His meaning may be thus briefly summed up: "In this particular instance, even to our own-selves, it needeth caution and explication how the testimony of the Spirit may be discerned; for the operations of that blessed Agent are universally things secret and undiscernible even to the very soul where they are." That Hooker's argument is of this nature, appears with incontrovertible evidence, from the fact of his including in his phrase the *extraordinary*, as well as the *ordinary*, operations of the Holy Ghost: his words being; "The operations of the Spirit, especially those ordinary, which are common unto all true Christian men, are, as we know, things secret

and undiscernible," &c. Is not this proposition, in its plain and obvious sense, to be understood of the operations of the Holy Spirit *universally*? Again, when he explains the nature of that caution, of which he had spoken, he uses a phrase which, unless it had been accompanied by some express limitation, cannot be otherwise understood than as applying to the whole circle of duties—alike to the *credenda* and the *agenda* of the Christian: "We stand on a plainer ground, where we gather by reason, from the quality of the *things believed or done*, that the Spirit of God hath directed us in both these," &c. In short, I am astonished that any person, considering with attention, and interpreting with fairness, the whole passage as it stands in Hooker, could assign to him the sentiments which your correspondent appears to do. Equally at a loss am I to discover how the other passages from Hooker, or the quotations from Barrow, Sherlock, Butler, and our Seventeenth Article, confirm the notion of your correspondent. I see in most of them an acknowledgment of the influence of the Holy Spirit on the inward principles as well as on the outward conduct—on the heart and affections as well as on the understanding; but I see nothing even approaching to the assertion, that the Holy Spirit's agency is *in itself perceptible, and of itself distinguishable from the natural workings of our own minds*. The language of the Article especially is at variance with your correspondent. Let particular stress, or rather (I do not hesitate to say) let the *proper* and *intended* stress be laid on the words immediately following those which he has marked with Italics, and the passage will speak strongly against him: "Such as feel in themselves the working of the Spirit of Christ *mortifying the works of the flesh and drawing up their minds to high and heavenly things*." Is not this whole sentence

intended to describe persons who arrive at a consciousness of the Spirit's working, by considering *the effects produced*—who are then only sure that they feel this working, when they can observe the works of the flesh mortified in them and their minds raised to high and heavenly things? I can only understand your correspondent's misapplication of authorities by supposing, that when he speaks of the "perceptible operation of the Holy Spirit," he means *internal influence and guidance*, as opposed to the *outward regulation of the conduct*. If such be his meaning, his quotations are not altogether irrelevant: but surely in this case he has been betrayed into an extraordinary incorrectness of language. And if such be his meaning, he has been at much pains to prove what no sober Christian will deny; what at all events the Dean of Chester has not even questioned. That this really was his meaning I collect from the following passage of his letter: "Does it appear by these extracts to have been the opinion of this great author, that the operations of the Spirit are things secret and undiscernible, even to the very soul where they are; or (which the Dean is evidently aiming to es-

tablish), that we are to collect the sincerity of our religion exclusively from our outward conduct?" Between these two things, which your correspondent thinks to be the same, I perceive a very wide difference. The former opinion I hesitate not to ascribe to Hooker: the latter belongs neither to Hooker nor to the Dean of Chester. Has your correspondent read attentively the following words of the sermon he censures? "When instead of looking to *faith* and *penitence*," &c. Ought a passage like this to be accused of confining attention to outward conduct? Is not *faith* an act of the mind properly so called? Is not *penitence* so in a great measure, and in an important branch of it? Does not the mention of a *cleansed heart*, and of *bad appetites subdued*, recognise the propriety and enforce the duty of scrutinizing the inner man as well as the outward conversation? Surely, far from being inconsistent (as your correspondent seems to intimate), the Dean is in exact agreement with himself, when he afterwards quotes Hooker as asserting, that "unto the privy intents and motives of men's hearts, religion serveth for a bridle."

N—S.

MISCELLANEOUS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

As you were pleased to insert, in your Number for July, 1814, some observations which I offered on the duty of religious children to their parents, I trust you will now admit into your Christian miscellany some remarks on the corresponding duty of religious parents to their children. But before I enter on the subject, I will frankly lay before your readers

the occasion of the present paper, which is no other than a remark I have heard with pain, from those perhaps more conversant with large religious circles than myself, that all is not quite right in the conduct of parents of reputed piety, towards their children. And this remark, made to one who had been the humble monitor of children, has seemed to me a sort of conscientious call to offer, likewise through your pages, a few hints

to parents, upon the ground of the foregoing suggestion. Whether, indeed, that suggestion be correct is not the present question. The point I am desirous to ascertain is simply this: *Supposing* the charges to be just, in what light are we to consider them? And, if they should not be, in whole or even in part, justified by *fact*, the party addressed will, I trust, be induced more powerfully than before to adopt the apostolic rule; *by well-doing to put to silence the ignorance of foolish men*.

I propose, therefore, to consider, first, The alleged faults; secondly, Their natural effects; thirdly, Their causes; fourthly, Their remedy.

I. It has been remarked, that religious parents do not sufficiently attend to the *deportment* of their children. By this it is meant, that they tolerate a certain freedom of behaviour, which too closely approximates to *rudeness*; and sometimes actually assumes this character, much to the surprize, if not to the annoyance, of those who may happen to come into contact with them. And the extent of the present charge, I presume, may reach to this, that the parent is apparently unconcerned at the misconduct of his child; that he administers no reproof, and exercises no interference.

A second remark is, that religious parents allow too great a latitude to the *conversation* of their children, or permit them to occupy too much the attention of their friends; the consequence of which is, in some degree, the prevention of that more grave and enlightened discourse, which forms one of the highest privileges of *civilized society*: and it has been asserted further, that religious parents hear, with seeming unconcern, the unbecoming speeches of their children to their guests or visitors, and apparently overlook, even if they do not encourage, certain flippant answers to themselves.

Religious parents have been also accused of neglecting to restrain the *evil tempers* of their children. This charge, I apprehend, would signify, that the parent omits to use that temperate and christian discipline, which, though it may sometimes prove ineffectual, is still the divinely appointed means of making the rough places smooth in that department of the human heart; and which (as Mr. Babington has happily shewn in his invaluable little work on Christian Education) is consistent with the purest exercise of Christian and parental love.

I doubt whether I should in propriety add a fourth charge, which respects rather the consequences of former neglect, than any present oversight in religious parents. This would include those maturer faults in their children, such as extravagance in dress or in purse, and general lightness and indecorum, if not vice, in conduct and in conversation, which they would at length be happy to restrain, but, finding it too late, are obliged unwillingly to pass over in despair.

II. Supposing the above accusations to be just, or even partially so, let me proceed to trace the natural effects of such parental negligence.

The *first* impression, perhaps, of the irreligious observer, in such a case, will be, that the parents are insincere in their religion. And this will appear the more probable when we recollect that, in the vocabulary of but too many persons, *seriousness* and *hypocrisy* are nearly identified; yet, even where candour, or discernment, may forbid such an incongruous association of ideas, may not the worldly spectator question the religious sincerity of him who is *apparently* indifferent to the spiritual welfare of his children? May not the remark be too naturally made, "Can this man actually believe that the rude manners, the unbridled conversation,

the harsh tempers, the riper follies or vices of his children, are irreconcilable with the commands and the example of his Saviour, and inimical to their eternal interests, and yet make no proper effort to correct them? Can the parent look up in true faith to the Redeemer, and nevertheless sit silent and contented while his offspring continue *practically* uninfluenced by Christianity? I am very well aware that such reasonings may be carried beyonds the bounds of fairness; but at the same time it is too evident how much the neglect in question tends to discredit the cause of Christianity itself, and to prevent the extension of her happy empire in the world.

Next, the supposed neglect will give rise to *comparisons* as prejudicial to the character of the parents themselves as to the honour of religion. May it not be remarked, for instance, by a superficial mind—"I go to day into the family of a professed religionist, and I am struck with the rudeness of the children and the apparent unconcern of their parents. To-morrow I visit a friend, who, renouncing all pretension to seriousness in religion, is benevolent, upright, and decorous in his general behaviour; and I observe in his children a sedateness of manner, a modesty of conversation, and a proper restraint of temper and propriety of appearance and behaviour."—The worldly spectator would, under such circumstances, confidently ask, "Where is the advantage of this profession of religion; of family prayer; of attention to the duties of the Sabbath; of efforts to extend religious knowledge; if the man, who passes for a mere moralist in the religious world, perform those parental duties which are overlooked by his more doctrinal neighbours?" I am persuaded that such comparisons have too often injured the cause of true and undefiled religion.

Again, the neglect we have supposed cannot but be highly injurious to the personal religion of the parents themselves. For what can more delightfully attract, or more powerfully stimulate, the soul of a parent than the view of his children humbly following their Saviour? What parent, who possesses any degree of love to Christ, would not feel, like David, the fire kindle in his heart, as he witnessed his children in any measure under the influence of genuine piety? How great, then, is the parent's loss when such an encouragement is wanting to his faith, and such a refreshment to his soul! And how bitter his sensations while he reflects, "Had I attended as I ought to have done to the *deportment* of my children, as well as furnished them with religious admonition, they might now have quickened and sustained my progress in the path of eternal life!"

Another and a yet more weighty consideration remains to be brought forward; namely, the injury arising to our children themselves from the causes now under review. Must they not lose a portion of that general esteem which a parent would willingly secure them? Must not their peace be wounded sooner or later by the prevalence of unchristian tempers; and (to contemplate the utmost boundary of the melancholy scene) may they not be excluded at last from the eternal presence of God, by those very corruptions which the parent negligently suffered to increase and multiply? The agony of such a consummation to a *Christian* parent, I know not how to express.

III. We have to inquire into the *causes* of that parental neglect we are considering.—To develope these is a task of some difficulty: I shall, therefore, attempt no more than to discover those which are the most prominent and striking. I begin with that mistaken fondness, which is natural to all mankind, and which

too often powerfully operates on the minds even of religious parents. What else can blind the eyes of such a person to those faults of his children which are obvious to every disinterested observer; and which provoke, in no small degree, the animadversions of the world; especially when we recollect his desire (which I have throughout supposed) to conduct his children to the chief, the good, Shepherd, that He may "take them in His arms and carry them in His bosom?"

I may next mention mistaken views of the *effects* arising from *indulgence*. Here, as in numerous other instances, our abhorrence of one extreme often drives us to the borders of its opposite. The parent, in his anxiety to shun that harshness of discipline and that severity of reproof which are hostile to the genius of Christianity, appears almost to lose sight of the sacred admonition, "He that spareth the rod hateth the child," and hopes that *indulgence* will gradually dissipate faults, which Scripture and experience declare will yield to discipline alone.

I may enumerate, thirdly, the voluntary avocations of the parent. This cause will readily occur to every considerate observer. I do not allude to his engagements in his worldly affairs, so much as to others of a more pleasing nature. For example: religious societies are multiplied; every succeeding year furnishes some fresh proof of their excellence and usefulness; annual meetings are holden to celebrate the triumphs of Christianity over the powers of Jewish prejudice or Pagan darkness; and from these reviving festivals the most zealous advocate of Christian missions derives fresh fire to his zeal, fresh vigour to his resolution. I should be very far from breathing one unfriendly wish towards such valuable institutions, or disparaging that Christian zeal which would support them. I must, however, be al-

lowed to ask, is not the religious parent sometimes so *much* occupied with the concerns of these excellent societies (especially if he be an acting member), and so intent upon enjoying the high gratification which is provided in religious anniversaries, that his *domestic* system becomes sadly interrupted, and the welfare of his children endangered?

Lastly, I must mention the neglect of prayer. Though this duty cannot be entirely relinquished by such as would retain any degree of Christian life, it may be so negligently and hastily performed, that the pulse of devotion may gradually languish in the soul. And may not this lamentable decline take place in the religious parent, who so devotes himself to the cause of charitable societies and religious institutions, as to neglect, in a considerable degree, the spiritual instruction of his own children? And, where the parent fails in either or both these points—earnest supplication and assiduous instruction—is it wonderful if his children fail, in exact proportion, in their spiritual inquiries and attainments?

IV. I would consider the remedies proper to be applied to these evils. —Let the religious parent, in the first place, form a just estimate of the infinite value of his children's souls. It is too obvious to require proof, that his care of their immortal interests will exactly correspond with his impression of their real worth. He may also fitly and profitably meditate on the sacrifice of the Son of God to save mankind. Indeed, the cross of Christ may well be regarded as a standard by which to determine the value of the human soul; not to mention that agency of the Holy Spirit, and that ministry of angels, which are well adduced, in one of the tracts of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, entitled "a Pastoral Letter," with a view to represent more evidently the amazing worth of the immortal part of our nature.

Now the religious parent, who contemplates these things, will so balance the value of the soul against every other consideration, as to determine, with all his energy of mind and body, never to rest till he sees his children walk before the Lord to all well-pleasing, and evidencing, in their life and deportment, whatever is lovely and of good report, whatever may adorn the doctrine of God their Saviour, and render true religion a subject of pleasing and delightful, instead of painful and revolting, associations.

Next, let the religious parent consider *his own responsibility*; in order to be more powerfully constrained to form the manners of his children by the Christian model. Let him reflect how soon and how solemnly it will be asked by the Judge of all the earth, whether this has been his settled aim and his unceasing effort—whether he has been more anxious for the present or the eternal interests of his children—and, whether he has consulted more his own ease or the Divine glory, in all the circumstances of their education?

Further, the religious parent should, as far as consistent with other duties, be a person of domestic habits. I would not, indeed, overlook the many cases in which he may conscientiously absent himself from the family circle. He may even plead the authority of our blessed Lord himself for *going about* doing good; and the argument will be valid so long as his intentions are really similar to those of the Redeemer. Nay, more; religious persons are the proper instruments to form pious or charitable institutions; and, by active labour and unabated zeal, to promote their prosperity and usefulness. Nevertheless, a limit must be set by Christian prudence to such exercises of Christian charity. The religious parent should seriously think, “What portion of time can I devote to the support of religious institutions, with-

out essentially injuring the spiritual interests of my children?” taking care especially to observe how far his occasional absence affects their conduct or temper; and determining rather to deny himself a personal gratification, than be absent from the important post of parental duty.

I need say but little respecting the *example* of the religious parent on his children; as its influence is universally confessed, and ought to be deeply felt by all who have received that “heritage and gift which cometh of the Lord.” It will, therefore, be sufficient to remark, that some such questions as the following should be continually rising in the religious parent’s breast: “What, if my child should tread in my steps this day; what, if he should copy my actions, my words, my spirit! would he thus be led towards God and heaven; would he thus become a follower of Jesus Christ?” The result of such inquiries would be a holy jealousy of ourselves, lest our children should learn by our example to wander from God; and our conscience being thus awake, our conduct might be happily instrumental to their advancement in holiness and their eternal salvation.

I cannot conclude without reminding every religious parent of the incalculable efficacy of *prayer* in all Christian undertakings, and especially in the education of children. And here I may very seasonably quote the inspiring language of Dr. South (Sermon on Matt. xxvi. 41): “Prayer is a blessed messenger between Heaven and earth, holding a correspondence with both worlds, and, by an happy intercourse and sure conveyance, carrying up the necessities of the one, and bringing down the bounties of the other.” Let the parent, then, continually employ this sacred, this friendly messenger; especially when he has to contend most with the evil propensities of his children, or those of his own bosom; and in so do-

ing he may anticipate a return from heaven, of grace, and mercy, and peace for himself and his offspring, in time and in eternity.

PARENS.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

THE following letter is transmitted to you in consequence of a wish repeated to the writer, a clergyman of the Established Church, that it should appear in your publication. It was written in reply to a letter of inquiry from a private gentleman, who detailed various particulars respecting the religious situation of a parish with which he was connected; and was solicitous for advice whether, under those circumstances, it was not his duty to bring (to use his own language) the preaching of "the pure Gospel," into the parish, by introducing a teacher in some dissenting communion.

L. M.

Dear Sir—I wish that any thing which I may suggest may be at all satisfactory on the important subject which you mention. If a case were supposed of persons destitute of means adequate to salvation, any one who could furnish adequate means, under whatever form of Christianity, would be bound to furnish them. But I have frequently thought that the situation of English parishes, not favoured by Providence with such incumbents, or curates, as ministers of Christ ought to be in doctrine and in conduct, is occasionally described in language very unsuitable to the actual state of things, and in such a manner as to represent a case such as I have just mentioned, as a case, in fact, almost parallel to that of the heathen world.

I am confident that you will feel with me, that an accurate estimate of the means of salvation already existing in any parish, must be essential to forming a right judgment on any specific plan in contemplation for improving it. The inhabitants

of the parish to which you refer possess at present, under the blessing of the Divine Grace, the following advantages:—First, The free use of the Scriptures. Secondly, The opportunity of attending twice on a Sunday the service of our church; in which service, be the officiating minister who or what he may, the Gospel of Christ is actually and fully *preached* to them (excuse the expression) in the numerous and ever varying portions of Scripture; Psalms, Lessons, Epistles, and Gospels, which constitute a regular part of the service; and also in a truly evangelical liturgy, continually and prominently bringing forward all the essential doctrines of our faith, and in no respect contravening them. Thirdly, and most happily, The inhabitants are in a great measure under the influence of a lay gentleman, who, with a partner co-operating in his plans, is blessed with the desire in his heart, and with pecuniary ability, to circulate largely among them the Bible and unexceptionable religious books and tracts; and to encourage, by prudent marks of favour, those who give solid proof of being really worthy of patronage.

Now of persons so circumstanced it cannot justly be said, that they are not in the enjoyment of means adequate to salvation. What a blessing should we deem it to bring a Hindoo or a Tartar village into such a state! But the inhabitants, it appears, labour under the misfortune—and do not think that I do not regard it as one most deeply to be lamented—of having a minister who, in one, and I own a most important, portion of Divine service, namely, the sermon, propounds sentiments at variance with those which have been propounded in the preceding portions. Of course, a similar variance will attend his private instructions.

The question, then, which you propose, resolves itself into an inquiry of comparison: Is it probable

that good *would finally result, on the whole*, from an attempt to improve, by the introduction of a teacher such as you mention, the existing means of salvation in the parish? The answer requires the balancing of benefits to be expected and of evils to be anticipated. The nature of the benefits expected is obvious: and they are likely to have been fully weighed by yourself. The evils to be anticipated from such a measure are very serious:—First, A certainty, or a very high probability, that a number of persons will be permanently alienated from the Church of England; which church I understand to be preferred by you to every other. Secondly, Divisions and separations in the church of Christ, so much deprecated in Scripture, will be effected; and this not on account of wrong imputed to the church, but merely from disapprobation of one of its incidental ministers. Thirdly, Heart-burnings, dissensions, and party-spirit will arise in the parish. Fourthly, There will always be a risk of being disappointed in the teacher introduced. He *may* prove not truly pious; or he may be pious and very considerably indiscreet; or he may soon remove elsewhere, and leave you to a repetition of risks. I am afraid too that I must add, meaning nothing disrespectful to any man, that in a teacher of the particular connexion you mention I could not altogether promise to myself the “*pure Gospel*,” without mixture or adulteration, but must count upon some doctrinal excrescences not belonging, as I conceive, to the Gospel. In teachers of other denominations *other* excrescences might be apprehended. Fifthly, Suppose that the incumbent's views should become altered (a most fit subject for earnest prayer); or that he should take a curate who is diligent and pious; or that he should be followed by a diligent and pious successor;—still the separation, once begun, will conti-

nue, however much those who, with the very best intentions, introduced it, may themselves lament the step which they took. Allow me to adduce an example. It may now be twenty years or more, since, in a parish in my own neighborhood, some religious individuals, wearied with the sad state of things in the church there, introduced an Independent Minister. In no long time the clergyman fell into declining health, and died; having, however, been brought, as I understood, during the course of his illness, and through the Divine blessing on the instrumentality of a religious son, to real penitence and a Christian frame of soul. He was succeeded, about eighteen years ago, by a decidedly pious clergyman. This good man soon died, and was succeeded by another equally valuable. The successor, after some years, removed to another living; and his place was immediately filled by the present vicar, still a young man, who is quite equal to his predecessors. The gentleman who introduced the Independent Minister has openly lamented that he did so: but said, that, as he has been brought, he must be supported. I may add, that, if I am rightly informed, the present Independent Minister there, who is an able man, and may, I doubt not, be a religious man, is an avowed and a violent enemy to the Church of England, and has republished and circulated at least one bitter tract against it; though the three successive clergymen have all been men of piety, gentleness, candour, and moderation.

Believe me, &c. &c.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

HAVING lately seen the Prospectus of a new translation of the Bible, by Mr. Bellamy, I think it but an act of duty to the public to offer a few remarks upon it.

He begins his Address in the following words:—"It may be necessary to inform the public, that no translation has been made from the original Hebrew since the 128th year of Christ. In the fourth century Jerome made his Latin version from this Greek translation, from which came the Latin Vulgate; and from the Latin Vulgate all the European translations have been made; thereby perpetuating all the errors of the first translators."

It would not be easy, I conceive, to point out, in the compass of a few lines, such a number of misrepresentations (to use no harsher word) as are crowded into this short extract; in contradiction to which it is necessary to inform such of the readers of Mr. Bellamy's Address, as need information upon the subject—

1. That *after* the 128th year of Christ, when the Greek version of Aquila (to which, I suppose, Mr. Bellamy alludes) was completed, *two* other translations from the original Hebrew were made in the course of the same century; namely, that of Theodotian, about A. D. 186; and that of Symmachus, A. D. 200.

2. That Jerome did *not* make his Latin version from "this" Greek translation, (I suppose Mr. Bellamy means the translation of Aquila,) nor from *any* Greek translation, but *from the original Hebrew*. If Mr. Bellamy does not know this, or if he doubts it, let him examine the translation itself, or the author's prefaces to the several books of the Old Testament, or his letters to his friends on the subject of his translation, or the letters of his friends to him, or the testimonies of many of the early fathers, particularly St. Augustine; all of which may be found in Jerome's works, or in the preface to the Hexapla of Origen.

3. That it is by no means *clear* that the Latin Vulgate came from Jerome's translation; though it is *probable* that the *modern* Vulgate (so

called in contradistinction to the ancient Vulgate, or the *Italica*, which appears to have been made from the Greek Septuagint version before Jerome's time,) has been much indebted to the labours of that learned father.

4. That *all* the European translations have *not* been made from the Latin Vulgate. On the contrary,

(1) In the sixteenth century alone, there were *several* Latin translations from *the original Hebrew*; in particular, that of Pagninus, afterwards adopted and improved by Montanus—that of Munster—that of Leo Juda (which commonly, I believe, goes by the name of *Vatablus*)—that of Castaleo—that of Junius and Tremellius, and perhaps some others.

(2) Unless I am very much mistaken, *Luther's German translation* was made *from the Hebrew*: indeed, his history leaves scarcely any room to doubt the fact.

(3) It is particularly important, in reference to Mr. Bellamy's assertion, to let it be understood that *our present authorised version* of the Bible, commonly called King James's Bible, *was made neither from the Latin Vulgate, nor from any other translation, but from the original Hebrew itself*.

As this last point is of more immediate concern to us than any of the others, I shall not content myself with a bare mention of the fact, but shall establish it by some quotations from the Epistle Dedicatory to the King, and the Address to the Reader, prefixed by the learned translators to their work. I quote from the edition of 1634, in which the pages and paragraphs are not numbered.

"For when your highness had once, out of deep judgment, apprehended how convenient it was that out of the *original sacred tongues*, together with comparing of the labours, both in our own and other foreign languages, of many worthy men who

went before us, there should be one more exact translation of the holy Scriptures into the English tongue, your majesty did never desist, &c. ...

... And now at last, by the mercy of God, and the continuance of our labours, it being brought into such a conclusion," &c.—(Epist. Dedicat.) "In this confidence and with this devotion did they" (the translator's speaking of themselves) "assemble together; not too many, lest one should trouble another; and yet many, lest many things haply might escape them.—If you ask what they had before them, truly it *was the Hebrew text of the old Testament, the Greek of the New*. These are the two golden pipes, or rather conduits, where through the olive branches empty themselves into the gold If truth be to be tried by these tongues, then whence should a translation be made, but out of them? *These tongues*, therefore, the Scriptures we say in those tongues, *we set before us to translate*," &c. (To the Reader.)

"Truly, that we might not vary from the sense of that which we had translated before, if the word signified the same thing in both places (for there be some words that be not of the same sense every where,) we were especially careful, and made a conscience, according to our duty. But that we should express the same notion in the same particular word; as, for example, if *we translate the Hebrew or Greek word once by purpose*, never to call it intent thus to mince the matter we thought to savour more of curiosity than wisdom," &c. Ibid.

"..... we, if we will not be superstitious, may use the same liberty in our *English versions out of Hebrew and Greek*." Ibid.

I entertain little doubt but that other evidence, in addition to that here brought forward, might be adduced in refutation of Mr. Bellamy's assertions; and perhaps this

may be done by some of your readers who have access to sources of information from which I am precluded. Enough, however, has, I think, been said to excite more than a suspicion, that Mr. Bellamy is grievously deficient either in accuracy of knowledge or in fidelity of representation; qualities, neither of which one should choose to dispense with in a *translator of the Sacred Volume*.

It will, doubtless, excite surprise in the minds of many persons, as it did in my own, that an author should be found adventurous enough to hazard his reputation for learning or honesty upon such assertions as those which have here been considered. For myself, however, I will readily confess, that my *surprise*, though not my *indignation*, ceased when I turned to the other side of Mr. Bellamy's Address, and read the specimens with which he has favoured us of what we are to expect from the labours of "twenty years devoted to this work." As he "pledges himself to bring full authority from the original," for any variation he has made from the received translation, it would be premature, and perhaps unfair, to pronounce upon the merits of any of the "selected" emendations exhibited in the Prospectus, I am much inclined, however, to think, that neither your learned nor your unlearned readers will cherish any very sanguine hopes of improvement to our present authorised translation from the critical labours of a gentleman who can seriously propose such alterations as the following:—

Gen. vi. 6: "Yet Jehovah *was satisfied* that he had made man on the earth; *though he idolized himself* at his heart."

Ibid. ver. 14: "Make for thee an ark of the wood of Gopher: apartments shalt thou make in the ark; *there thou shalt expiate within and without, by atonement*."

Gen. xxxvi. 3: "Now Israel preferred Joseph before any of his

181
sons
shift
a ve
I
when
Saul
T
of in
num
think
be de
is, th
or "t
respe
Mr. I
is a p
by no
whate
ever
amelio
sion, I
when I
his lab
true as
when S
and as
"the E
is the l
and ren
best."

To th
In your
writer, v
made so
the Peac
me to of
ply, with
into a le
subject,
see occu
ber of yo
X Y Z
necessary
present s
his allusi
bunder-s
"fainted
God. T
statement
tracing

sons; for a successor of the eldership after him: and he made for him a vesture of supplication."

1 Sam. xvi. 23: "Now it was when the spirit of God was upon Saul."

That our translation is susceptible of improvements in a considerable number of instances may safely, I think, be allowed, and can scarcely be denied. That "a new translation is, therefore, *absolutely necessary*," or "that our translators have erred respecting things most essential" (as Mr. Bellamy affirms in his Address), is a position to which I, for one, am by no means prepared to assent. But whatever may be wanting, or whatever may still be effected towards the amelioration of the authorised version, I do not despair but that, even when Mr. Bellamy shall have brought his labours to a close, it will be as true as I believe it to have been when Selden made the observation, and as I believe it now to be, that "the English translation of the Bible is the best translation in the world, and renders the sense of the original best."

H. G.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

In your Number for January last, a writer, who signs himself X Y Z, has made some remarks on the Tracts of the Peace Society. Will you permit me to offer a few observations in reply, without any intention of entering into a lengthened controversy on the subject, which I should be sorry to see occupy a disproportionate number of your pages?

X Y Z seems to consider war as necessary, and inseparable from the present state of humanity, and, from his allusion to the "hurricane and thunder-storm," to view it rather as appointed, than merely permitted, by God. This differs widely from the statement of the Apostle James, who, tracing the origin of all contests,

charges them at once upon "the lusts that war in the members;" in the same manner as, when treating of temptation, he vindicates God from any inculpation, and affirms, that "every man is tempted by his own lust, being drawn away by it, and enticed." It is the referring all wars to a Divine sanction, that appears to be the ground on which many upright and well-meaning persons have justified so dreadful a practice. But it is well to remember, that "the wars of the Lord" (see Numb. xxi. 14) are of a different character from those merely political contentions which nations have been accustomed to indulge in. Under the Theocracy, the Divine Sovereign issued a sentence of extermination against certain idolatrous nations, of which sentence the Jews were, for obvious reasons, appointed the executioners. I ask, whether there is here any warrant for a human monarch, and his subjects, acting from their own impulse, without any authority from God, and impelled by motives of ambition, jealousy, revenge, or the like, to engage in a sanguinary and protracted warfare with a neighbouring nation, on the assumed ground that it is *just* and *necessary*? And if there is no warrant here, it will be difficult to find one in any part of Scripture.

X Y Z is not aware, that "in this country war can be viewed as a custom;"—but, taking the last century as a specimen, we find (if we reckon the hostilities in British India, and in other parts, besides those on the continent of Europe) at least five or six wars in the course of it, occupying more than half of the century. Now, surely this amounts to a *custom*, especially when we consider that the last war alone may be said to have lasted nearly five and twenty years, or the fourth part of a century.

Your correspondent is dissatisfied with the statement, that "all the precepts contained in the New Testament, addressed to individual

Christians, are equally applicable to professing Christian *states* and *political bodies*." Yet why? Are not all states and political bodies composed of *individuals*; and must not the same injunctions which are binding on them as individuals, be considered as regulating their conduct in their associated state? Is there one set of precepts in the Gospel addressed to individuals, and another to states? Is not the monarch an *individual*; his prime minister the same; and so on of the other authorities throughout the kingdom? Will they not be judged as individuals? And what is required of them, but that the same pacific principles which they acknowledge in their individual capacity, should become influential in their official condition?

In reply to the remark, that "war includes *bloodshed*, *not unawares*, which is the scriptural definition of *murder*;" your correspondent asks a series of questions, to all of which he might easily have given the same answer, had he recollected that the transactions he alludes to occurred under a *Theocracy*, and that the scale of punishments was distinctly graduated by *God himself*. Until the same can be affirmed respecting our duty under the Christian dispensation, it is useless to propose such queries.

X Y Z observes, that "it is not the duty of every Christian to occupy himself with the more profound questions of political economy." To this I would answer, No, not of *every* Christian. But, are not Christians more competent to discuss such questions in their most important *moral* connexions, than other men are, and more likely to do it with calmness, and with due respect to the ruling powers? I have read the "Pictures of War," as well as X Y Z; and it appears to me, that the author or compiler has been studious to avoid every thing of an offensive nature, as far as was in his power, consis-

tently with what he owed to his subject.

Again; it is observed by your correspondent, that "*in just and lawful war*, it is no more *murder* to deprive the enemies of our country of life, than for the public executioner of justice to put to death the murderer." But your correspondent has not condescended to define what a *just and lawful war* is. Will he point out, among the six wars of the last century, which were just and lawful, and which were not—or were they *all* of this description? Were those of the late French Ruler just and lawful? Had X Y Z been a subject of that government, how would he, in Christian integrity, have felt himself called on to define them? And if some of them were not just and lawful, such as the invasion of Moscow, how would he have acted, if required to serve therein in a military capacity?

In a work recently published, entitled, "Letters descriptive of a Tour on the Continent in 1816," there is, *inter alia*, an account of the Anabaptists in the valley of Moutier; and it is said of them, that they are believers in the Trinity, and in the Atonement of Christ; but they agree with the Quakers in denying the lawfulness of oaths *and of war*. In a conversation held with some of them by the Tourist, they stated, "that neither the Prince Bishop of Basle, a Roman Catholic, under whose government they formerly were, nor Bonaparte, to whom they had since been subjects, had ever exacted military service of them; but that now, on this district's being recently annexed to the canton of Berne, that Protestant Republic required them to find substitutes, which had cost about twelve of their number about eighteen *louis* each; that this demand was very grievous to them as a poor tenantry, to say nothing of their conscientious objections; that

it had induced them to think of the painful alternative of emigrating; and that a few of their young men were already gone to America, to report to the rest; that there was no doubt of their reluctance, on account of their numerous families, and that many proprietors in the country were much concerned at the risk of their being driven to quit it, as they were good tenants." What would X Y Z say to such a statement? Would he pity both Anabaptists and Quakers, as being under a delusion, in regard to their scruples about war; or finding that Quakers in England, Baptists in Germany and Switzerland, the Saints in Norway, the Duhbortzi in Russia, the Waldenses in Piedmont, and the Shakers in America, are all averse to national hostilities, will he inquire what authority these conscientious men find in Scripture, or what they discover in the Christian character, that produces or perpetuates this aversion? Perhaps, a closer examination not merely of the letter but of the spirit of the New Testament, might render X Y Z much less disposed to the toleration of hostile practices, without depriving him of a single particle of his loyalty.

In page 25 of the Christian Observer, X Y Z imputes to the author of the "Pictures of War," sentiments, which, on turning to the book, I find, belong rather to Dr. Rush of Philadelphia, and ought to have been placed to his account, although quoted by Irenicus.

To conclude; I beg leave to propose the following questions for the consideration of your correspondent:—

Does Christ, or do his Apostles, any where in the New Testament, *enjoin the practice of war*, either directly or by implication?

Do the passages in the New Testament, which mention the ruler or supreme magistrate, relate to his

military duties, or to the administration of justice?

Do the same passages describe him, in relation to his *wars with other nations*, or in relation to the *government of his own subjects?*

Do the passages in Rom. xiii. or elsewhere, descriptive of the duties of Christian subjects to their rulers, include or imply an obligation on them to enter into the army and perform military duties?

If there really exists such an obligation, are not French, Spanish, or German Christians only obeying their own rulers, when they invade Britain, murder British Christians, and do them all the mischief they can? And are they not rather to be treated with respect, as acting loyally to their several governments, than viewed as robbers and murderers?

Is not this also making the will of a *fallible* (not to say an *ambitious* or a *vindictive*) ruler the sole guide of the Christian's conduct in such matters?

As there may be public national *laws* which are contrary to the laws of Christ, so may there not be public national *wars* contrary to the whole spirit of Christianity, in which a conscientious Christian cannot warrantably take an active part?

Is it at all probable, that any practice can be sanctioned by Scripture, which leads to so many abuses, moral, political, and personal, and which is so inconsistent with that amiable and tranquillizing spirit which reigns throughout the Christian scheme?

A B C.

To the Editor of the Christian Observer.

Respected Friend—

A FEW days past, I wrote a letter to a clergyman in my neighborhood, who had lent me the Number for January of the Christian Observer, that I might see a few observations, under the signature X Y Z, respecting the Peace Society. Soon after

I had written the letter, and previously to its being sent, it occurred to me that there might be some utility in letting the writer of the observations see what I thought of his essay. The following are extracts from my letter.

I am, with best wishes,
Thy friend, J. C.

"I consider myself under obligation to thee for the loan of the Christian Observer, containing some strictures on the publications of the Peace Society. I believe the cause of truth never has suffered, nor ever will suffer, from mild and candid discussion. I can well believe that the writer of these strictures apprehended he was engaged in a good cause; but his arguments appear to me very far from conclusive. In the first column of page 23, he says, 'Were it possible to realise the views of this Society, the effect must be to paralyse the arm of power, introduce discord, confusion, and bloodshed, into the very bosom of society, and lay the country open, as an easy prey to any unprincipled and ambitious aggressor.'

"I have a small book now before me, written by a valuable member of the Society of Friends, lately deceased, in which he says: 'We come now to the arguments used in defence of war, the principal of which I apprehend to be, that it is unavoidable and necessary. Whilst mankind are disposed to live under the influence of their passions, and to sacrifice their dearest interests to their avarice or their ambition, this plea will not be wanting. But let us consider what proofs have been given that war is really unavoidable. Has any nation fairly made the experiment, and failed? Where is the country that has regulated its conduct by that justice, that liberality, that love, that humility, and that meekness, which Christianity requires, and yet has found war unavoidable? Can we contemplate the

characters of the individuals who have been the rulers of nations, and say, that such have been the dispositions which regulated their public and private conduct, and that still they have not been able to preserve their country from war and bloodshed? Till all this can be clearly proved, the argument from necessity is of no weight. But that I may not be thought to reason chimerically, I shall shew that a people hath existed, who, acting upon those Christian principles, preserved their country from war and bloodshed, even while their neighbours were frequently involved in them. Pennsylvania, it is generally known, was originally the property of one called a Quaker, who filled most of the offices of the government with persons of his own persuasion. Had not the conduct of these people (Pennsylvanian Quakers) towards their neighbours, both Indians and Europeans, been recorded by men totally unconnected with the Society, my relation might appear partial and interested: but history, impartial history, has transmitted the conduct of these people to posterity in such a manner, as renders it unnecessary for me to say more, than that, so long as they retained their ascendancy in the state, which was about sixty or seventy years, *neither internal nor external war was permitted to disturb their peaceful habitations.* We do not say, that occasions of difference never occurred: but other means of settling their differences than those generally resorted to were pursued; and if not successful, submission was wisely preferred to the violent and precarious decision of the sword. If it cannot be shewn that men, living and acting in a truly Christian spirit, have found war to be necessary and unavoidable, the argument assumed must be considered as destitute of foundation.'

"I should have been glad to refer thee to some other instance of the

1818
bene
ciple
Pen
know
and
be p
I wo
prin
actio
Chri
that
was
duct
form
profe
"I
page
Peace
awe
small
lemn
thou
from
tion,
of the
I do n
rit of
Thou
of the
Peace
Russi
really
the E
a man
them.
"T
tract
respec
Christ
or of t
Father
war, I
for thr
period
earlies
consider
page 1
the sec
subject
ians to
With
early C

beneficial effects of truly pacific principles in government besides that of Pennsylvania; but I really do not know where to find one. If my life and the Emperor of Russia's should be preserved for twenty years longer, I would gladly hope to see those principles brought conspicuously into action on a large scale; for does not Christian charity require us to believe that his profession in the 'holy league' was sincere? And has not his conduct since the time that league was formed, been conformable to that profession?

"In the second column of the same page, something is said by X Y Z of Peace Societies attempting to overawe the civil government. In the smaller tract which I now send, (*Solemn Review of the Custom of War*), thou wilt find prefixed, 'An Address from the Peace Society in this Nation,' and a copy of the constitution of the Massachusetts' Peace Society. I do not perceive any thing like a spirit of overawing in either of these. Thou wilt also observe, by the letter of the Secretary of the Massachusetts' Peace Society to the Emperor of Russia, what that Society's views really are; and, in the answer, what the Emperor, whom I consider to be a man of some penetration, thinks of them.

"T. Clarkson, in p. 6 of the third tract of the Society, says: 'With respect to the opinions of the first Christian writers after the Apostles, or of those who are usually called the Fathers of the Church, relative to war, *I believe we shall find them alike for three hundred years, if not a longer period. Justin the Martyr, one of the earliest of those in the second century, considers war as unlawful.*' And in page 15; '*Every Christian writer of the second century, who notices the subject, makes it unlawful for Christians to bear arms.*' Also in page 8; '*With respect to the practice of the early Christians, it may be observed,*

that there is no well authenticated instance upon record of Christians entering into the army for nearly the two first centuries; but it is true, on the other hand, that they declined the military profession, as one in which it was not lawful for them to engage.'

"X Y Z endeavours to turn the attention of his readers from the view of military robbery, fraud, &c. to 'the Christians of our army and navy.' Alas! what proportion is there of real Christians in our fleets and armies? How very few Gardiners, Burns, or others of kindred spirit!

The writer, in page 24, col. 2, undertakes to criticise the volume entitled, '*Pictures of War.*' It does not consist entirely of extracts, though it contains many, and I think very excellent ones, and very judiciously and neatly arranged: but there are several original observations, or at least what the compiler, if he may not be called the author, considers as such. Permit me to hand thee a short extract from the Preface.

"His (the compiler's) intention has been, not so much to obtrude his own remarks, as to display the sentiments of *eminent writers*, who have, either incidentally or otherwise, handled a subject which is confessedly of universal importance, but seldom discussed, and perhaps too frequently decided upon without full examination.' The author is of no political party, and has no private interest to serve. Submission to the 'powers that be,' on Christian principles, forms the basis of his political creed; and he trusts that nothing of a contrary tendency will ever be suggested or contended for by him.' And again: 'What is here said on the subject, is not designed for the purpose of reproach against any class of men, but with a desire to befriend and benefit all who have not examined it closely; and to rouse Christians to the consideration of their apparent duty; namely, to unite in propagat-

ing and in exemplifying pacific principles.'—Dost thou see any thing in this declaration, or in a conduct conformable to it, inconsistent with the character of a genuine Christian? I confess that I do not.

"I think no Christian pastor who sincerely adopts the petition, 'Thy kingdom come; Thy will be done

on earth as it is done in heaven;' can avoid desiring to see universal peace extended over the earth.

"With desires that thou mayest acquire and preserve a large portion of that wisdom which is so beautifully described by the Apostle James, (iii. 17,) I remain, &c."

REVIEW OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

Cursory Hints on the Application of Public Subscriptions in providing Employment and Relief for the Labouring Classes. In a Letter to the Editor of "the Times." BY A MEMBER OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD. London: Murray. 1817. 8vo. pp. 22.

Considerations on the Poor Laws. By JOHN DAVISON, M. A. Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. Oxford: Parker. 1817. pp. iv. 122. 8vo.

A Treatise upon the Poor Laws. By THOMAS PEREGRINE COURTNEY, Esq. M. P. London: Murray. 1818. 8vo. pp. vi. 168.

Considerations on the Impolicy and Pernicious Tendency of the Poor Laws; with Remarks on the Report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons upon them; and Suggestions for Improving the Condition of the Poor. By CHARLES JERRAM, A. M. Vicar of Chobham. London: Fenner. 1818. 8vo. pp. 157.

THERE is no question at the present moment more interesting to the enlightened charity of the nation, than that which is raised by the Poor Laws. It is but lately, indeed, that it has been thought right for charity to be wise, or possible for discretion to be charitable. It seems to be but a recent discovery, that liberality may be the more productive for its means

being husbanded with prudence, or the more beneficent for its operations being directed with judgment; and hence, for a long series of years, the profligate mendicant intercepted the alms which should have gone to the domestic sufferer; idleness obtained more relief than merit, because it created greater want; and acts of humanity were measured, not, like the proceedings of an infirmary, by the number of patients cured, but rather, like its apothecary's bill, by the cost of the medicines distributed. Their amount was valued without taking notice of the good which was done by their interference.

Thus, in estimating the benevolent spirit of our laws, which we are far from disputing, it has been usual to cite the sums annually raised for the benefit of the poor in parish rates throughout the country, without at all moving the question, in what degree the poor were enriched or essentially benefited by the tax. Six millions a year! This was at once the proof and measure of the national bounty; and the nature of the calculation would go far to shew, that even the charity of the country partakes of its mercantile character; though certainly the prudence of a mercantile proceeding does not appear in its proceedings.

The Report of the Committee on Mendicity helped to raise the po-

pular feeling, on a question respecting which erroneous notions had been too long acquiesced in. This was followed by a season of general distress, in which the poor's rates threatened to consume the whole rental of the country; and while men were looking about them with surprise, to find the growth of pauperism accelerated in proportion to the amount of taxes levied to relieve it, the valuable Report of the Committee on the Poor Laws, of which we have given an abstract in a former Number*, came out to solve the mystery and explain the paradox to the national understanding.

That these circumstances have had a great share in producing that increased information respecting the means, and ends, and objects of charity, which is now becoming so prevalent, there can be little doubt in the mind of any one who has observed the recent commencement as well as the rapidity of the change. Few persons now fail to perceive, that it is as necessary to inquire what is done with a charitable donation, as what is the amount; that undistinguishing liberality may even impoverish those who depend on it; and that, in order to be profitable or beneficent even to its objects, it should never have the effect of relaxing, but rather of stimulating, those efforts which would otherwise be made by the assisted individual for his own relief.

Among other principles, therefore, which are now generally admitted, though long apparently forgotten, one is, that in relieving such temporary distress among able and industrious men as may arise from want of employment, it is not beneficial to give assistance without exacting labour: and this principle, accordingly, during the winter before last, was extensively acted upon by all those local committees which were formed

to alleviate the distress of the country. For the same and other reasons, the practice, which is now universal, of granting pecuniary relief from the parish rates, to active labourers, in consideration of large families or deficient wages, is generally disapproved.

Here, indeed, a political principle mixes itself with the question of charity; and while, on the one hand, it appears to be injurious to the moral and industrious habits of the poor themselves, to give them a title to relief altogether independent of their character and exertions; on the other, it is argued, that if the work of the labouring classes, which are the productive classes of society, is inadequate to their maintenance, it is impossible for the other classes of society, which are at least comparatively unproductive, to maintain them; that their support must, in fact, come from the produce of that labour, and if so, that it is much better it should be derived to them, as the clear reward of personal industry, than as a mixed benefit, made up of wages and charity. It is hence thought by many, that it is a wise policy to furnish work for those who are out of work, but extremely unwise to make up the scanty earnings of those who are employed, by a national disbursement in aid of wages: and this is precisely the policy of that Act of Elizabeth on which the whole fabric of our poor laws is founded.

In this stage, then, of the inquiry, we come to a question of very great moment, and which is now before the public and the legislature; namely, whether the task of finding work for all who may happen to be destitute of it ought to be attempted by law. That it was contemplated by the framers of that important Act is probable. That it is now attempted by those to whom the execution of that Act is entrusted is certain. That, if the attempt be practicable, it ought to be made,

* See No. for January, p. 32.
Christ. Observ. No. 196.

may safely be conceded. Whether, however, the attempt be not, in its very nature, impracticable, is a grave and debatable question.

To this question, we confess, we are inclined to give a decided negative; and among the reasons which have induced us to bring the second of the pamphlets, which stand at the head of this article, before the notice of our readers, one is the clearness with which the author of it seems to have demonstrated in different ways the utter impracticability of the attempt; and if he has succeeded, the view he has given of the subject cannot but have due weight in determining that remedy which is now anxiously desired for the perturbed state of our internal polity. The whole question resolves itself into these particulars: first, whether there be any permanent cause, inherent in our national system, tending frequently to throw a number of useful labourers out of work; and secondly, whether it be practicable, by any legislative enactment or any philanthropic exertions, to find these labourers in productive employment as often as, in the course of the natural arrangements of society, they are thrown out of it.

On the first of these questions, we have nothing to add to the following acute and judicious observations.

"In this country there are two causes, as I suppose, which do actually threaten to throw a considerable number of hands constantly out of employ, not perhaps always in the same district, nor of the same technical description; but still to leave in some part or other of our system a great stock of unapplied labour. These causes are, first, the Poor Laws themselves; and next, the fluctuating nature of our Manufacturing and Commercial Industry." Davison, p. 27.

"That these two causes separately and jointly do in fact tend to burden the country with a number of supernumerary hands,

scarcely needs a solemn shew of proof. The Poor Laws accelerate the growth of the population by a premature increase, inasmuch as they enter into an engagement beforehand to provide for all, though neither the mode, nor the station, of employment for all is either foreseen or provided, nor any solid security taken from principles of general calculation, that the room for employing them will exist, or if it exist any where, that it shall be accessible just as it shall be wanted. The undertaking of the law is upon a *carte blanche* to the population. The provision of the employment is deferred to a subsequent and most precarious arrangement, which hitherto has proved absolutely fallacious. No adequate occupation has been found for those whom the law has undertaken to support. It generates an evil which it vainly attempts to remedy by a tardy and subsequent application. It creates the labourers. It cannot, as I shall attempt presently to explain, create the employment for them. It has to go begging itself, to find methods of fulfilling its own obligations.

"The effect of our manufacturing and commercial industry in adding to the same inconvenience is apparent. These two branches of our national system are engaged in the production, or the circulation, of commodities of an unequal demand and a shifting market. Besides causes within the country, which may vary the activity of them, they are open to the fluctuations which may be induced by changes in the condition, the wants, or the tastes of all that circuit of the world abroad, with which they have any point of connexion. War and peace alternately supplant many of the foundations upon which they rest, and other minor agents come in among them to their sensible disturbance. In this unsteady system, supposing the whole effective demand upon our labour of manufacture or of circulation, to remain a constant quantity, it is not always for the same commodities, nor in the same channel, that the vent offers itself. There may be an increase in the whole effective demand, and yet many hands may be thrown out of work; because manufacturers of a given description may work more; but still if there be a remission of the demand in any single department of industry, there, in that department, the exclusion from labour will take place; and the whole sum of activity will be maintained, not by an equable partition of the labour, but by a partial increase

of it in one kind, and a depression of it in another. The stimulus of a thriving trade in one branch will make that quarter swarm; and when it is depressed, its superabundant labourers will not be taken off by the alternation of success in another, but the thriving line will rear and attract labourers of its own. The supernumerary hands will remain such, and will be thrown therefore for a time upon their own economy, or upon the Poor Laws, which discharge them from that economy. If an instantaneous transfer of residence, as well as of manual habits, were practicable, the shock of these fluctuations would be less felt than it is. But both the one and the other are impossible to any great extent. The mechanics especially, and artizans of an improved country, are not so many units, but compose so many classes, which are not readily interchangeable in kind, any more than they can easily migrate to the new momentary home which a prosperous local trade at a distance might chance to offer them. It follows, that these disengaged men become so much burden upon the other members of the community, and press heavily upon the moving wheels, which they cannot help to turn themselves." Davison, pp. 28—31.

In regard to the second question, relative to the possibility of finding productive work for the unemployed labourers, the following remarks seem equally humane and enlightened.

"That it is impossible to furnish them with productive employment, I should venture to rest upon this simple principle: that the activity, vigilance, and sagacity of private interest in the way of regular trade, would always be able to take up any business, and make it prosper, sooner than the unskilful attempts of any body of overseers, commissioners, philanthropists, or legislators. This appears to me a principle almost self-evident: and the consequence from it must be, that a general system of parochial manufacture of any kind with a view to profit, or with a hope of making such establishments maintain themselves, is a chimera, a castle in the air, which only the architects of a most visionary policy will ever think of building." Ibid. p. 33.

"If it be alleged, that the parish could afford to let out its labour at a cheaper rate than others could do, and might so have

the advantage of the market for that labour; no doubt it is possible by the application of parish labour to break down some private dealers: but then the command of the market so obtained would be producing harm to the right and the left; and though the parish might be dealing more largely, the impossibility of making a profit, and keeping within its expenses, would stand just as before.

"We are driven to the inference, then, that no real supply of productive employment can be furnished by legal arrangement, when the trade of the country itself fails to furnish it.

"The question may be taken up again from a consideration of the whole amount of means in the country applicable to the encouragement of labour; and the conclusion we should arrive at in that way would not be materially different." Ibid. pp. 34, 35.

"The managers of the parochial taxes might carry for a time a supply of money to a languishing trade, and lay hold of an opportunity to spend more judiciously for the promotion of labour than the original proprietors would have done. But to imagine that there could be a continuance of this superior wisdom of distribution in the parochial management, and found a national measure upon that assumption, is against all reason in a country where trade is well understood. Trading capital, when once it is created, and demand of labour, attract one another in the strait course of things with invariable certainty. In a rich country, when work is wanted to be done, money is soon found to set that work a-going, and in a spending country all the work is wanted which there is the power of paying for. In our own country, which is both the one and the other, rich in possession and spending by habit, there is an activity and an enterprise in the investment of capital in traffick, which, not at the long run, but after a very short race of competition, must soon leave behind the awkward movements of a parochial committee. Consequently I infer, that the sums transferred to the parochial fund by law for the encouragement of labour, will soon be applied to less advantage for that given purpose, than they would have been under the free discretion of the proprietor or trader." Davison, pp. 36, 37.

Temporary circumstances, we admit, may render it expedient to devise the means of supplying work to the unemployed poor; but, even in such cases, we are decidedly of opinion, that the object should be effected not so much by means of a legal impost, as by a fund of voluntary contribution from the rich. But although this seems to us by far the least undesirable mode of setting the poor to work, it is obvious that much forethought and judgment will be requisite in framing the rules by which the application of such a fund, if once raised, should be governed. On this subject, some opposite remarks are contained in the first of the works now under review, which is devoted to the practical determination of the question, how far the subscriptions of private benevolence may be able to relieve, and how far they ought to relieve, the inconveniences arising from a temporary stagnation in the ordinary channels of employment.

"The simple practical rule to be adopted is to select such work only as would not otherwise, in the common course of things, be taken up. It ought, strictly and precisely, to be the extra work, for which there are already no funds provided, and by the execution of which no one can be wronged or deprived of his fair trade. If public committees take up work which it is already the duty of any existing funds to execute, they relieve unnecessarily and unfairly those funds and the parties intrusted with them. The work done is no gain to the public. It might have been had, or ought to have been had, without the effort of a contribution. If they take up work which should, in the common course of trade, go to the established tradesman or manufacturer, they supplant his custom, rob him of his profits and subsistence, and, by weakening and impoverishing his capital, prepare the way for making themselves the sole masters in that line, with the increasing necessity of continuing in the trade much longer than they are dreaming of. For every workman discharged from the master tradesman will come

upon them for employ; and it is easy to understand that a growing trade driven at a loss, as theirs will be, the more it is extended, will be the greater burden and expense to the public bounty.

"Even when only the smaller and more contracted systems of trade, as those of builders, carpenters, and other master-artificers, are rudely invaded by the operations of committees, volunteering to perform, without any of their agency, the work which would of itself go to them, and so intercepting the supplies of their work and profit; the consequent immediate evil is more than sufficient to undo all the merit of the charity, and desecrate the best works so executed." *Cursory Hints*, pp. 4, 5.

"In the whole range of such questions, there is, perhaps, no one more obvious truth than the prudence of keeping entire and active the working capitals of the country, from the highest of them to the lowest. They are the very sources of the perpetual renovation and vigorous increase of all our effective means. They alone can feed and supply the productiveness of public and private revenue, which, without them, would be as waste and silent as rivers dried up in their channel. From the scanty funds and outfit of a huckster's shop, or the simple apparatus of a plough and a team of oxen, up to the larger combinations of skill, machinery, and general arrangement, in which mills, looms, and steam-engines, are among the subordinate labouring forces to clothe and furnish our civilized life with all its costly improvements, it is the master's capital which puts all in motion, as it is his mind which directs the whole movement. His ruin is soon marked by many a wheel standing still; and a long train of disbanded workmen follow in the funeral of his traffick. The smokeless chimneys of a deserted family-mansion (a sight much too frequent at this moment) are not such sad signs of impoverishment to a neighbourhood as extinguished steam-engines, and the desolate picture of the decay of extensive works, encumbered with idle and moss-grown wheels, and the stock in trade to be sold for the benefit of creditors. In proportion as ruin creeps upward in the productive classes of society, the public loss sustained is the heavier. Destitute workmen and destitute manufacturers fall back a burden

upon the country, instead of being its support. And if any part of such distress should be owing to the interference of injudicious charity, our regret would be the greater to see the inconvenience produced by misdirected virtues." *Cursory Hints*, pp. 10, 11.

The view which Mr. Davison has given of the mischievous effects of attempting to direct by law the work of the labouring classes, appears to us to rest on the most solid principles of political economy. It will derive a farther confirmation both from considering the many social and moral evils produced among the labourers themselves from an authoritative interference with their ordinary pursuits, and from the numerous advantages which belong to a state of society in which they are left to regulate their own employments according to their interests and ability. Mr. Davison's work abounds with valuable remarks, which will be found to have a very intimate relation to this important subject. We must confine ourselves to a few extracts.

"To have really the charge of his family, as a husband and a father; to have the privilege of laying out his life upon their service, and of seeing them rest exclusively on his protection, is the poor man's boast, in the estimate of the mere relative conditions of life. He himself is all the better for having so grave a charge upon his hands. The wants of his family are his call to work; and no call sounds more piercingly, or more gratefully, to an uncorrupted ear. There is music in it, with all its sharpness. But the breath of the parochial law tarnishes the colouring of this family picture of cheerful native virtue. It flings another atmosphere upon it. By exonerating him from the sole charge of his offspring, it abrogates the father's proper character. It makes him begin to think them an incumbrance, from which he ought to be discharged. It means, indeed, to do no more than take off from him the load of their support; but it does take off the pressure of much sacred obligation. It makes him and them less intimately pledged to each other; less dear to each other. It sows thistles among the flowers.

And is he the happier for this substituted relief proffered to him, almost imposed upon him, by a fixed practice? Suppose he has yielded to the temptations of its convenience, so far as to accept it without repugnance, he retains neither the same solid claims upon the gratitude of his children for an undivided care of them; nor can they look up to his example with reverence, nor feel the same force of filial piety, expanding into a great motive of future reciprocating duty. In the country especially, the family ties have been nearly burst asunder by the artificial adoption which the law has made of the children. It has made parents, children, and brothers hardly know themselves to be such. The interposition for their necessities has disbanded their affections." *Davison*, pp. 68, 69.

"For the country, I assume, that if the poor rates were withdrawn from their connexion with labour, the wages of labour would rise. I assume with much more confidence, that, in such an event, they ought to rise, on two separate grounds. The farmer, hitherto, has palpably speculated upon the poor rates in his bargain with his men; this has been the general practice; according to the farmer's own calculations therefore he ought to advance his wages, if the poor rates should no longer enter into them as a part. But there is another and better ground to expect that rise of wages; inasmuch as the probable improvement in carefulness, attention to his master's interest, and desire to gain his good-will, on the part of the labourer, would make his service worth more than it is now. For the parish relief, though often reckoned *bona fide* by both master and labourer as part of wages, has not the effect of wages in quickening the labourer's heart for his work." *Ibid.* pp. 100, 101.

"In the country, the labouring class, if they chose it, and were either trained, or reduced, to the best management of their own interest, might establish themselves in greater comfort and ease of condition, independently of the advance of their wages. They have resources and facilities not to be had in towns. Their garden, their potato ground, their speculations in pork and poultry, and other incidents of a simple course of management, are at hand, in addition to the leading task and duty of their hired labour, to promote their subsistence, and without diminishing their competence for their main service. The

very quiet and comparative solitude of the country, are circumstances favourable to habits of occupation and domestic attachment. This is the posture of the labourer's condition; an account of what he might be, if he availed himself, or were more obliged to avail himself, of the opportunities before him." Davison, p. 102.

"The art and method of being a cottager would make an insipid treatise: it would be a most productive practical study. And that the political economists may not think too meanly of its value, let them say whether the live-stock of a cottager, of whatever size or kind, and the produce of his garden, are not real subsistence, and subsistence added to the whole public store: whereas the pay of the parish only gives him a title to consume some part of that which has been raised already. The whole value, however, of such an improvement in the methods of the labourer, will depend upon their being taken up at his own cost, upon his own risk. Donations of land, which cannot be general, neat cottages built to his hand, and other artifices of humanity, do not help the condition of the class, upon any certain and permanent principles. The labourer must continue to work in that character still, from first to last. And then the additions to his comfort will never be at the risk of disturbing the system of the country. I reckon upon these accessions of subsistence, not as the foundation of his main support and livelihood, but only as an equivalent to him in part for his parish relief; which turns his mind wholly away from them. And excepting the inherent and unchangeable fault of human nature, which must be an equal datum on every side, there is no one reason so likely to explain why our parochial poor in the country are so deficient in intelligence, in activity, in good sense about their own interests, as that they have been kept in a state of pupilage, and not permitted to think for themselves to the extent even of their next day's support. One moral use of the necessities of men seems to be that of calling forth their understanding. Common reason absolutely must begin at that point, of a stimulating necessity: and the labour of thought is the last labour that men will take up, if they can in any way do without it." Ibid. pp. 105, 106.

"The manufacturing labourers, who are the other class to be considered, are brought

to distress by two causes, differing from each other—their own habits of life, and changes in the prosperity of their commerce. Of the two, their own habits are their worst evil, in the degree of it, quite as much as the blame of it. Their wages are so high in good times, that if they worked steadily and lived with moderation, they might very well reserve out of them a fund of supply against a time of want, which would carry them through, till their trade revived, or till they had settled and adapted themselves to some new occupation. But the whole history of their life is of the most opposite kind, as far as it can be comprised in any one general description. The excesses of these men, in their intemperance and prodigality, the rashness and recklessness of their expenditure, their division of the week into days of work, and days of the most gross and obstinate idleness, and the unfeeling neglect of their families, are some of the striking lines in the character of our manufacturing population. In numerous instances, the indigence of these people, which the law takes such anxious and extraordinary pains to relieve, implies more of real moral delinquency, and more harm to society, than many of the crimes for which our most severe penal statutes have been framed. And one consequence of such a life is, that when it meets with any check, they have such distempered and extravagant notions of a necessary support, as make them ready to spurn the fare and diet which other people hardly enjoy in the times of their most perfect competence. They become destitute and unreasonable at once." Ibid. pp. 107–109.

"The system of manufactures then may be considered as circulating among its dependents, though not evenly and uniformly, a stock of wages fully adequate to the wants of those dependents: only the inequality of circulation must be met by a certain line of conduct very different from that which these men now pursue; and pursue with the greater confidence, under the bill of indemnity granted them beforehand by the Poor Laws. Reformation of their manners to any degree of sobriety, providence, or domestic care, would be both a moral and political benefit, beyond every other. Every thing that can be done towards it deserves to be encouraged. And every thing that can be done

"Th
serves,
And th
sacred
ing but
where
be foster
favour.
extreme
cayed a
female
gleness
orphan
it and
claims
country
granted

is not more than is necessary. Education, religious instruction, and whatever else can be applied, will all find work here for their largest endeavours. But instruction, whether to old or young, must be futile in the end, if the law continues to speak, as it now does, and with a great practical force, in a sense opposite to all sound instruction." Davison, p. 110.

Let it not be supposed, however, from the anxiety with which we have sought to impress our readers with the injurious effects resulting from the present compulsory system of parochial relief, that we would wish to supersede the exercise of an enlarged and discriminating charity, or to abandon the poor so entirely to their own resources, that nothing may be done for the mitigation of occasional distress. On the contrary, we only wish to husband the resources of charity as well as of labour, that so the savings of the one may the more abundantly supply the deficiencies of the other. An ample field will yet remain for the exercise of benevolence; for "the poor we shall always have with us." But charity will then be better directed, and will be productive of relief to the misfortunes and actual disabilities of the poor, without becoming a bounty on their indolence and improvidence. On this point we entirely concur with Mr. Davison.

"The fundamental principle," he observes, "of our Poor Law was charity. And this principle ought to be preserved sacred and entire, in all cases where nothing but charity can help the claimant, and where nothing but unequivocal charity can be fostered by a provision of the law in his favour. Upon this ground, the wants of extreme and hopeless debility in the decayed and worn-out labourer, the wants of female decrepitude in the destitution of singleness or widowhood, and the wants of orphan infancy, should remain, not only as fit and allowable, but as most imperative claims upon the public humanity of the country: the legal support being to be granted in all these cases, as it is at pre-

sent, only when there is no near relative of sufficient ability to bear the charge of it on the motive of a natural duty of kindred." Davison, pp. 92, 93.

"Instead of thinking," adds this able writer with much force and feeling, "that the present expenditure, made in the relief of persons like these, is carried too far, or that there is any excess in the usual grant of it, I should hail it as one of the most satisfactory consequences of a stricter frugality of the law, in all its other branches, if out of that frugality a more effectual maintenance could be secured to them. It is only the discharge of a debt to our common nature, when its extreme and guiltless imbecility, under destitution in old age, is made a special object of care: and there is much reason why the law, if it is to attempt charity at all, should exercise it on cases of want like these, rather than any others. For they are cases of a continued and uniform indigence, and therefore they are of a simple management; they are the most safe from the suspicion of abuse, and therefore fit matter for a general enactment; and they are the least likely to be adopted into the care of private benevolence, on account of the permanence of the distress in them, a circumstance which commends them so much the more to the protection of the law.

"The humanity which it was designed, by the original text of the main statute upon this subject, to infuse into the law of the land, is a memorial of English feeling, which has a right to be kept inviolate; and its just praise will be better understood, when it comes to be purified from the mistake, which either a careless abusive usage, or an unpractised and inexperienced policy in the extent of its first enactment, may have combined with it. It is the page of mercy in a book which has to deal much, of necessity, in severer things; and there is a spirit of Christian kindness in it, particularly fitted to recommend the whole authority of law, as a system framed for the well-being of its subjects. I would therefore as soon see the best clause of Magna Charta erased from the volume of our liberties, as this primary authentic text of humane legislation from our statute-book. And if in the course of a remote time, the establishments of liberty and humanity, which we now possess, are to leave us, and the spirit of them to be carried to other lands, I trust this one record of them will survive, and that charity by law will

be a fragment of English history, to be preserved wherever the succession of our constitution, or religion, shall go." Davison, pp. 94, 95.

With these views of the general question, we are concerned to find, that a sensible, temperate pamphlet, should have appeared, admitting the correctness of all the main principles for which we are anxious to contend, but yet quarrelling with their practical results, and having for its apparent object to prevent, by an excess of caution, those sounder maxims from being acted upon, which yet it holds to be theoretically correct. We are the more surprised at this, because the treatise of Mr. Courtenay, which we are now describing, does not dispute the mischievous tendency of the present system, any more than it questions the soundness of those principles on which we are desirous to see a better one constructed. Mr. Courtenay, indeed, plainly admits, that our poor laws tend, *in theory*, "to generate vice and misery" (p. 17); and that though their principle be benevolent, their operation "does not generate benevolence;" for "nothing can be less like charity than an order by a justice, or an allowance by an overseer." (p. 154.) He is even of opinion, that "an union of sturdiness without honest confidence, and abjectness without modest humility, is the natural result of pauperism," as it exists in this country. (p. 155.) He thinks, indeed, that the mischiefs actually resulting from those laws have been exaggerated; and that, allowing for the increase of population between 1803 and 1815, and the advance in the price of wheat during the same period, the evil of pauperism had in those twelve years been diminished in its extent. But even an increase of the rates and of the number of paupers, as compared with the population, would not, in his judgment, prove the destructive tendency of the

system, unless it could be shewn that our wealth also had not increased, and that even the assessable funds had not shewn a tendency to accommodate themselves to the growing demands upon them, whilst other funds, legally exempted, had moreover been daily expanding. In palliation also of the evils which are now generally ascribed to the influence of our poor laws, he urges, that those evils are known to exist even where these laws have no operation. He appeals confidently to the state of every nation on the continent, as well as to Ireland, where poor laws do not prevail, in proof that the evils of which we complain are not peculiar to that system. On the contrary, England, he is of opinion, stands above them in respect both of individual comfort and public peace. (pp. 5—9.)

Mr. Courtenay even argues, and with much ingenuity, that compulsory labour, or the attempt to employ labourers by taxation, may yet be productive.

"It is not impossible that, by rendering an article of general use cheaper and more abundant, it may come into more popular consumption, so as, on the whole, to give employment to a greater number of hands than were before engaged in its production: and as habit continues a demand after the immediate cause of it has ceased, the total demand for workmen in this branch might be permanently enlarged, and wealth augmented." Courtenay, p. 76.

"I have no disposition to dispute the general doctrine, that capital is more profitably employed by an independent proprietor than under any dictation of law." "But I am not satisfied that the unskilful employment of capital, however injurious to the immediate employer, is necessarily productive of loss to the nation. If the state "has not a monopoly it is a harmless competitor: its capital, instead of being returned with a profit, is dissipated and dispersed;—a melancholy result for the capitalist, but, as I suspect, a matter of perfect indifference to the public, if not rather beneficial.

"With these impressions, I cannot satisfy myself that the money expended

upon
the
lieve
pros
wea
been
assu
the
taxe
of ea
tribu
ment
prop
sanct
priat
diver
ducti
be, t
comm
creas
more
believ
lation
of we
more

"T
to a g
each p
session
of indiv
cessari
tor, in
clothing
which
food, to
agement
and to
had be
the rate
at least
dustry;
the aug
been lai
extending
pp. 79—

Even
were
Courten
the title
when r
preferen
which i
the conc
and 114
jection
the poli
the old
Chris

upon the poor is inoperative in increasing the wealth of the country." "It has, I believe, been found that the country has prospered most when the circulation of wealth and the exchanges of income have been most rapid and multifarious. It has assuredly thriven most remarkably under the most extensive imposition of public taxes, which have brought a great portion of each man's income to be applied and distributed by the government. The government certainly is not the least wasteful of proprietors; and according to the theory sanctioned in the Report, the funds appropriated by the government must have been diverted from a more economical and productive application. I believe the fact to be, that the public expenditure, be it in a commercial view profitable or ruinous, increases wealth, inasmuch as it sets wealth more actively and variously in motion; I believe that a multifarious and rapid circulation is of all things the greatest promoter of wealth, and that, generally speaking, the more a nation spends, the more it has.

"The Poor Laws give a forced direction to a great quantity of income; they compel each proprietor to transfer a part of his possession, in very minute portions, to a number of individuals, which minute portions are necessarily appropriated by the new proprietor, in great part, to the purchase of food, clothing, and other necessities. That part which is expended in all necessities except food, tends at least as much to the encouragement of free and independent industry, and to the augmentation of wealth, as if it had been expended by the contributor to the rates. The portion expended in food is at least equally operative in promoting industry; and it is as instrumental towards the augmentation of wealth, as if it had been laid out by the earlier proprietor in extending the growth of corn." Courtenay, pp. 79—81.

Even if the labour of such persons were ever so unproductive, Mr. Courtenay seems disposed to urge the title of able labourers to relief, when reduced to sudden distress, in preference even to aged destitution, which is often entailed upon us by the condition of nature. (See pp. 72 and 114.) But, surely, whatever objection Mr. Courtenay may raise to the policy of providing, by law, for the old and destitute poor, as if such

Christ. Observ. No. 196.

a state of want might easily have been averted by the providence of the sufferer (and we feel the force of the objection,) applies in a still stronger degree to the able bodied man who happens to experience the temporary failure of employment. Might not he also have made provision for this temporary contingency? Undoubtedly it ought to be our object in both cases "to discourage, and ultimately to frustrate, reliance on parochial relief." But our best hope that such relief will not be required to sustain the helplessness of old age, must arise from our teaching men, when in the vigour and strength of their manhood, to rely, under the providence of God, on their own exertions, and on their own forethought, for guarding against temporary distress, arising either from sickness or want of employment. If a man is not taught to be so prudent as to provide against a sickness, or remission of employment, of a few months continuance, what probability is there that he will be induced to make provision for future years of utter disability?

Mr. Courtenay also endeavours to meet the complaint, that the Poor Laws offend against that dictate of nature which renders the child dependent for sustenance upon its parent, and requites parental kindness with filial affection and respect, with the following summary reply: that, in fact, the payment, being made to the father without any specific appropriation, obviates the objection, though it creates many others.—(p. 50.) But in fact it does not obviate this particular objection: for though the specific appropriation of the allowance is not stipulated or secured by law, the ground of claim is undisputed, and the parent takes it necessarily into the account of his means of providing for his children. That is: both he and his children look to the public for their support; and the independence of the children

upon the parent, in feeling and in fact, is thus prematurely and unnaturally accelerated.

Yet with all these abatements Mr. Courtenay acknowledges the evils inherent in the present system to be so considerable, that he himself looks forward (though we certainly see nothing in his recommendation of practical amendments to support that expectation,) to an eventual abolition of it, as "the ultimate and desirable object." (p. 20.) With this profession we must also confess, that we have some difficulty in reconciling his argument, that our present practice, with all its evils, has a greater efficacy in preserving human life than is found to belong to any course pursued elsewhere; for if this be true, a system, which has such an advantage to boast of, though it may be amended, certainly ought not to be abolished. Our readers, however, shall have Mr. Courtenay's reasonings.

"I cannot omit the mention of an 'extraordinary fact,' mentioned by Mr Malthus, namely, that the proportion of births to the whole population is smaller in England than in any other country except Norway and Switzerland; a decided proof, when coupled with the acknowledged rapidity of our increase of numbers, 'of a very small mortality,—a distinction' (adds Mr. Malthus) 'on which we may justly pride ourselves.' Might it not be added—a proof of the efficacy of the system of which the Poor Laws are a part, if not of those laws themselves, in preserving the human life, in preventing or alleviating individual suffering?" Courtenay, pp. 14, 15.

Mr. Courtenay's observations on the general effect of the Poor Laws, as at present administered, are summoned up in the concluding page.

"The Poor Laws are, in their operation, attended with much evil: they press severely upon property, and they engender bad habits among the people. Yet they have not prevented England from growing in wealth and strength; and when we ac-

cuse them of breaking the spirit of the people, we forget that it is while this bad system has been in full activity amongst our peasants and artisans, that our armies, recruited among them, have been growing in renown for bravery and perseverance.

"There may be, and doubtless are, grievous faults in our economical as in our political institutions; but it is hard to say that either is incurably vicious, seeing how, with these faulty institutions, we have stood through the convulsions of the last five and twenty years. We may have stood, *notwithstanding*, rather than by the force of, our system of polity; but if we recollect, at the same time, the peculiarity of our institutions, and the singularity of our fate, it is not unnatural to imagine that the one may be connected with the other. If 'our timber has thriven in its strength of trunk, and pride of branch and foliage,' we may justly conclude that the soil is good, and the roots unhurt." Courtenay, p. 162.

And he adds his conviction—

"that although there is much in our system which requires amendment, we have no reason for apprehending that the Poor Laws will destroy us; and that, still retaining in our code, the principal of national charity, we shall not cease to be eminent among the nations of Europe, for the freedom and stability of our constitution, the variety of our resources, or the strength of our people." p. 162.

The case seems, in our view of it, to be, that we are engaged in a system fundamentally erroneous; corrected, indeed, in much of its tendency, by the sound sense and sober habits of the people, but yet wrong in principle, and mischievous in effect. It is not necessary, in order to demonstrate this, to shew that no good is done; nor, in order to recommend a better practice, to prove that no evil would follow. There is no human institution, productive of unmingled good; and, if it only appear that the evils, now existing arise out of the system itself, while the evils of a contrary practice, would remain in spite of the system, it would follow, that in the latter

case they would probably be more easy of correction than in the former. We must argue first on general principles; and when these are settled, minor difficulties may be disposed of in detail. But we must not suffer them to disturb or perplex our general reasonings, lest through the common infirmity of our understandings, we should arrive either at no result or a wrong one.

In the general conclusions at which we have hitherto arrived on this subject, we are happy to find that we are supported by so sensible a writer, and so experienced a magistrate, as Mr. Jerram; while his observations assume a more decidedly religious complexion, and are on this account so much the more valuable than those of any other of the writers now under review. We do not mean to say, that there is any essential part of Mr. Davison's system which is not in perfect harmony with Christian principles; but, at the same time, the connexion between that system and those principles, is rendered more apparent in the pamphlet of Mr. Jerram. The propositions which that gentleman endeavours to establish are the following; namely, "1. That all hopes of entirely removing the evils of poverty are vain; 2. That the present administration of the system of the Poor Laws tends greatly to aggravate those evils; 3. That the means which bid the fairest for success lie with the poor themselves, under the direction and assistance of the legislature, in conjunction with prudent and active charity." (p. 3.)

On the first of these propositions there can be no difference of opinion among those who acknowledge the authority of holy writ, any more than that the charitable relief of the distress arising from poverty is a duty binding on Christians. That "the poor shall never cease out of the land," is the declaration of Omniscience, as it is his solemn injunction,

that to such we should "be ready to give and glad to distribute," enforced by the heart-exciting motive, that, "inasmuch as we do it," from a regard to his authority, and gratitude for his mercies, "to the least of these our brethren," he will acknowledge it in the great day of account as done to himself.

In proof of the second proposition, Mr. Jerram argues, and argues, we think, conclusively,

1. That the system of the Poor Laws "creates the evil it professes to remedy," by superseding industry, sobriety, and forethought, rendering the labouring class reckless of the future, and preventing the natural inconveniences of neglect and vice. (p. 21.)

2. That it even "holds forth encouragement to the idle, the thoughtless, and the profligate, by securing to them all the temporal advantages they could have derived from sobriety, prudence, and industry." (p. 27.)

3. That it "breaks the link which connects the best feelings and best interests of the poor with their natural friends and patrons," their superiors in station. (p. 30.)

4. That it obviously tends to diminish the interest which parents feel in the fate of their children. (p. 32.)

5. That it is opposed to the ordinance of God himself, that "if a man will not work, neither shall he eat;" and to his declaration, that "if any provide not for his own, and especially for those of his own house, he has denied the faith and is worse than an infidel."

6. That "it strikes at the root of the benevolent and charitable feelings, and renders abortive all measures for bettering the condition of the poor." (p. 37.)

And lastly, That "it tends to universal pauperism." (p. 41.)

We can only glance at Mr. Jerram's remedies for all these evils. He proposes a thorough revision of the present system, in order that

no refuge may be held out to idleness, improvidence, or vice. The poor must be shut out from all dependence on foreign aid, where prudence and industry might have rendered that assistance unnecessary. They must not be permitted to lean upon others, but learn to support themselves. In the words of Mr. Burke, "patience, labour, frugality, sobriety, and religion should be recommended to them: all the rest is downright fraud." (p. 99.) It will be impossible for us to follow Mr. Jerram through all the modifications by which he would accompany this general rule, in order to abate the severity of its operation in particular instances, or in his exposition of the various means by which he would carry his principle into effect. Suffice it to say, that among his instruments we find "saving banks;"—"benefit clubs," which, however, he places very far below the former in the scale of utility, whether he regards their principle or their effects as they are now constituted;—"benevolent funds," and "legacies for the use of the industrious poor;" which we cannot but think more questionable than either, partaking as they do of some of the radical evils of the poor system;—in the country, garden ground, or ground for a cow or two, for which a rent should be paid;—and last, though not least, moral and religious instruction. "It is a complete destitution of all religious principle," Mr. Jerram justly observes, "which leads men to the 'wretchlessness of ungodly living;' and if ever we see men really industrious, provident, and moral, we must lay the foundation in Christian piety." On this subject he says much, and says it well, closing the whole with a sentiment, in which we most entirely concur; namely, "that all efforts" to repair the evil of our Poor Laws "will be abortive without moral culture."

In the mean time, if any attempt is to be made to continue the present

system, or, indeed, to substitute an improved one, of which some national provision for the disabled poor is to form a part, two things are essentially necessary, in order to give it efficiency, and to hinder a recurrence of the evils which now prevail; first, an improvement of the law of settlement; and secondly, a change in the order of persons, selected as overseers. On both these points, our author's, for the most part, are agreed. On the former, the observations of Mr. Davison, in particular (p. 80, &c.), are well worthy the attention of the legislature. On the latter, the same writer remarks, that the management of the poor is an object not unworthy the most liberal feelings of the upper orders.

And, "as to the interest and benefit of the poor in such an arrangement, it is certain," he adds, "that their affairs, when they require any interference by authority at all, are never in such good care, as when their superiors are induced to take an active and gratuitous part in them. The dispensation of good from the enlightened mind, the cultivated feelings, and the independent spirit of the higher ranks, in the way of disinterested service, is an invaluable part of the constitution of our country in its magistracy, and in some other instances of a less ostensible nature. It wants only a few distinguished examples to raise the name of Overseer of the Poor to a level with that of Magistrate." Davison, pp. 45, 46.

These considerations we think eminently deserving of the attention of all those Christians whom providence has blessed with ample means in respect of fortune, with a range of valuable influence, and with a command of their own time.

With respect to any other new regulations to be introduced, in conformity with his suggestions, Mr. Davison observes, that every considerate person must feel he is stepping upon the ground of most serious difficulty. Nevertheless, he does not altogether shrink from the duty. Mr. Courtenay, however, has given the suggestions of that au-

18
tho
we
the
fou
the
cont
catic
ten y
it fro
whor
ral as
main
in lo
other
he w
bodie
subsc
on ac
tracte
other
tice o
ber of
of exi
tion i
three
but it
tant re
riages
ing of
On
howe
appea
argue
rochia
selves
and fro
or old
draw
cessiti
his ve
ject.
direct
the wh
p. 24,)
it whic
princip
ties.
nounce
be ver
ties," l
"to offi

thor, in a compressed form, of which we therefore avail ourselves to lay them before our readers.

"Mr Davison has a plan of amendment founded upon this discriminating view of the several causes of distress: he would continue the grant of relief, upon a modification of the present scale, for a period of ten years; and would thereafter withdraw it from all but the aged and infirm poor, to whom, indeed, he would afford more liberal assistance: and he would admit of the maintenance of orphans, and of assistance in long-continued sickness, and 'certain other definite cases of severe distress.' But he would withhold relief from the able-bodied, substituting in lieu of it a voluntary subscription, and would make no allowance on account of children of marriages contracted after the passing of the Act; or, in other words, he would abrogate the practice of granting relief according to the number of children, with an exception in favour of existing marriages. There is a reservation in favour of those who have 'at least three children under the age of fifteen;' but it is not clear whether this very important reservation is meant to extend to marriages contracted subsequently to the passing of the Act." Courtenay, pp. 42, 43.

One of the most important parts, however, of Mr. Davison's pamphlet, appears to us to be that in which he argues against the institution of *parochial* funds, to which the poor themselves shall be made to contribute, and from which, in sickness, distress, or old age, they are to be entitled to draw relief proportioned to their necessities. We cannot follow him in his very able reasoning on this subject. We are anxious, however, to direct the attention of our readers to the whole of the discussion, (p. 9 to p. 24,) but particularly to that part of it which incidentally touches on the principle of parochial benefit societies. The grounds on which he pronounces against them appear to us to be very weighty. "Benefit Societies," he observes, "profess

"to offer a mutual guarantee against the

casualties and contingencies of life, as well as its more certain ordinary wants, out of a property too small to be exposed to the risks of other men's fortunes: and the history of such associations, in the discontent of them, the complaints of unfair distribution, and the manœuvres practised upon the direction of the funds, is partly a proof that the exercise of this mutual charity in money and kindness is not to be had among persons, whose hope and aim of gaining by the partnership disavow the pretence of a perfectly common benefit." Davison, p. 19.

"The value of benefit societies, is among such persons in society as are tolerably safe in a competency of subsistence, and have some surplus besides to lay out, upon the fate of which they can reckon without anxiety. The stake of the club ought to be upon the optional or occasional comforts, not upon the necessary subsistence of its members; otherwise they are gaming for their bread. Remedies to the Poor Laws must be sought in provisions applicable to persons not quite so high in the world as those for whom benefit societies are calculated. These associations may indeed keep some from falling upon the parish, but they are not so likely to discharge and take off those who are just within its connexion. Such persons require the most stimulating inducement of gain to be quite their own, and the fears of want to be wholly their own also. It should be constantly remembered, that it is not merely a security against misfortune that is wanted for them, but an antidote to their imprudence and neglect and misconduct. Community of fortune by association, upon the principle of a mutual assurance, is a fair provision against loss; but a most unfair one against delinquency and folly. It makes the good pay forfeit for the bad, by the very tenour of its rules.

"When the underwriters insure, or when merchants do it mutually for each other, it is against sea-risk, against damage by accident; and therefore the ship, to be a proper subject of insurance, must be sea-worthy, and there must be a sufficient pilot on board. There is reason in this. What would they think of an indiscriminate guarantee upon timbers of every sort, sound and unsound? So when a life-office insures, the life in question must not be in a deep consumption. In every case a certain worthiness of condition precedes the guarantee.

Unless therefore a survey shall be ordered, and a report made, upon the character of the parties to be combined together in parochial associations, it never can be other than mistake and fraud, to engage them that they shall mutually indemnify one another, against any thing more than casualties, or events absolutely out of their own power, and wholly independent of their manner of acting." Davison, pp. 20—22.

Mr. Davison, indeed, appears to us to limit far too narrowly the object of parochial saving banks, when he proposes that they should be "strictly confined to a provision against the extreme hardship of bodily infirmity, permanent and irremediable." We perfectly concur with him, however, in thinking that the "contributions from the poor themselves should be on the sole and separate account of each individual," and

"as a most necessary stipulation of justice, in order that he may never lose by the exercise of his economy, that the full amount of his contributions, if they should happen not to be ultimately withdrawn by his own personal want, or the remainder of them, should be restored at his decease to his family, or other representatives of blood; or perhaps, in default of near kin, as he might direct." Ibid. p. 24.

On these principles we believe that all the saving banks, whether parochial or not, hitherto formed, have been constituted.

If any persons think we are stepping beyond our proper province in thus advocating measures of a purely political nature, our answer is, that some change of measures is now universally contemplated, while yet we do not hear that any change sufficiently radical to meet the necessities of the case is in agitation: and surely it is the duty of a Christian observer to come forward on such occasions with his scantling of judgment, be it what it may, to contribute to the general stock, and co-operate in determining the result. The intelligence of the nation is that which constitutes our national fitness for any beneficial measure which may

be practicable: for, however wisely it may have been planned, any scheme may be defeated in its operation, if it be encountered by ignorance, perverseness, or bigotry, in those on whom it rests to carry its details into execution; and it therefore becomes in the present state of things a serious duty to assist, to the best of our ability, in circulating, through the country, those wholesome principles which may help to disentangle the intricate problem of our national perplexities, and to restore a sounder system. On this head, indeed, and in reference to the hope which such projects may excite, we are desirous to check our own more sanguine wishes, and those of others, by the salutary memento contained in the following passage.

"At the same time, projectors of amendment have no right to be very sanguine in the extent of their aims. For the particular interests of the country, which are the most nearly affected by the constitution of our Poor Laws, are by no means beholden to those laws for all the injury or benefit of which they are capable. We must not suppose, therefore, that if they were set as completely at ease as the most satisfactory removal of all that is objectionable in these laws could set them, they would immediately pass at once into a state of extraordinary high order, vigour, and perfection." Davison, p. 79.

But it must never be forgotten, that the morals, as well as the comforts of the poor, are deeply involved in the decision of this question; that, although political institutions, however wise, can never make a people moral, they may, if unwise, throw additional impediments in the way of their becoming so; and that therefore one of the several duties incumbent upon Christians, as members of a political body, is first to satisfy themselves in regard to the nature of that policy, which will most conduce to the welfare of their fellow-citizens, and then to lend to it, for the public good, the support of their un-

derstanding, of their example, and of their general activity.

Three Sermons on particular Occasions.

By the BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER.

London: Hatchard. 1818. 8vo. pp. 64.

DR. Lancelot Ridley, in his commentary on the passage in the Philippians, "to abide in the flesh is more needful for you," has the following observations on the duty of bishops:—"This place willeth that the coming of the bishop or pastor to his cure, should not be without spiritual profit for his flock; that it should be to the increasement of faith, by pure and sincere preaching of God's word; and that they should more and more rejoice in God, knowing God's benefits the better by the word of God purely preached by the bishop, pastor, or curate. And this place doth something reprove those bishops that be dumb, and will not preach when they come into their diocese; that will not feed their people with the food of the soul, but suffer them to perish without food for them. How should bishops increase the true faith of the people, that will not preach to the people God's word? For as faith cometh by hearing of God's word, so it is increased by the same word. And as Paul more regarded those things that should be profitable to others than to himself, so should all others do, both bishops, pastors, curates, and all the lay people. But alas, for pity! few or none seek other profit, but their own. And so they be well, and live in ease, rest, and pleasure, they care not what becomes of others, what pains or torments others suffer. But let every one amend this fault, and study to be profitable, as well to others as to himself. For we be not born for ourselves alone, but to glorify God, and to profit by words, counsel, works, and deeds, as God hath given us gifts and talents for that purpose. Not all

gifts be given to one, but to divers, that every one should be an helper to another, for every one needs help of another."

Such is the picture given by a father of our own church, of the duties of a Christian bishop. And though we should wish, as far as possible, to avoid personal allusions, we cannot but say that we have been somewhat reminded of this picture in perusing the Sermons before us. They discover so much Christian simplicity, so rigid an adherence to the great principles of the reformation, such a practical reference of these principles to all the uses and purposes of life, and so careful an abstinence from deep and unsettled questions, that we seem to be carried back by them into older days, and to meet again one of those early friends of the Gospel and the church to whom their successors stand so deeply indebted.

We are aware, indeed, that the question has been often agitated in what degree bishops should be preachers; in what degree they should turn aside from the task of superintending the pastors of the church, and become pastors and preachers themselves. When the late revered Bishop Porteus first entered on his course of weekly lectures, many persons were ready to charge him with an abandonment of his dignity, with the love of popularity and ostentation, and with a desire to share the laurels of public applause. But the bishop had strength of mind and character sufficient to encounter these imputations. He continued to pursue his object, trusting to the blessing of God, and the character of his sermons, to vindicate their author: and as we cordially approve of this proceeding, we shall think it right to state a few of the reasons which incline us to this opinion.

Preaching is to be considered as a means of public instruction almost peculiar to Christianity. Under the pagan institutions, nothing analogous to it existed. Indeed, as the heathen

philosophers had nothing to make known but the mysteries which were never disclosed to the multitude, they were not likely to employ any public and popular mode of instruction. Philosophers taught the studious in their groves and porches; but no pulpit was found in the temples of heathenism.

Under the *Jewish* dispensation, also, preaching, strictly so called, does not appear to have prevailed as a methodical and regular mode of instruction. The services of the priest were nearly confined to the temple and the sacrifices. There were indeed prophets, and schools for the sons of the prophets, who were the only class of teachers in Judea. But then the prophets, it would appear, addressed the multitude chiefly on extraordinary occasions; and when an afflatus from above prompted them to deliver some invitation of mercy, or to denounce some threat of wrath against Israel and the surrounding countries, "holy men of old spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." Occasionally prophecy cast a ray either to cheer the fainting minds of the servants of the true God, or to confound his enemies; but did not rise like a constant sun to enlighten and animate the pilgrim in his daily path. It seems, also, to have been the custom for any individual, who felt the disposition, to rise and offer any comment which suggested itself to him on the portion of Scripture read in the synagogue. But these accidental contributions of irregular, and perhaps often unqualified, expositors must have fallen far short in value of the regular and careful instruction of persons set apart for the work, solemnly pledged to its devout performance, educated with a view to the discharge of its duties, and undiverted by other employments from an unreserved dedication of their minds to this high and excellent object. It was on the introduction of the Gospel that this

means of instruction and moral reform was first brought into full and habitual employment. Religion was taught, not any longer by signs, or figures, or emblems, or enigmas—not by occasional explosions of religious fervour and feeling—not by the temporary irradiations of prophecy—not by the doubtful suggestions of unauthorised and unqualified teachers—but by the regular and divinely appointed ministry of preaching: "Go preach the Gospel unto all nations." By this, as an instrument, it appears that the great spiritual reform was mainly accomplished. "It pleased God," it is said, "by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe." It was after the *preaching* of St. Peter that "there were added unto the church three thousand souls."

We do not, then, hazard any thing in affirming, that preaching is to be considered as in some measure an instrument peculiar to Christianity. But we will even go further, and say—that, wherever real religion has decayed, it has uniformly been marked by a corresponding declension in the practice of preaching. Preaching prevailed in the church of Christ, till, under the popish usurpation, religion had almost sunk into a mere exhibition of external forms. When it became an object with the priesthood to conceal knowledge from the people, to cherish in them a taste rather for mummary than duty, for outward pageantry rather than the inward and spiritual grace of the Gospel, they ceased to preach. The services of the church became one great pantomime. Even at present, when the losses sustained by the Church of Rome, through the progress of Protestantism, and through other causes, may be conceived to have awakened something more of regard to the popular instruments of improvement, preaching is comparatively rare in their churches. In Rome it is scarcely to be heard, except at

the
tho
see
eyes
real
frien
to li
sition
the
spec
some
will
self,
pect
the E
Bu
coun
recog
it may
as, fo
to the
"My
But
witho
honou
impor
of the
of the
Gospe
cation.
But
pretty
preach
clergy,
church
as wide
much a
expecte
bishops
parative
whose
their m
than tha
only per
pected t
ing. S
ment of
we hav
such, w
ment of
tiner,
manner
one vas
Dover,
Chris

the four great festivals; and whilst thousands are collected together to see an image spontaneously open its eyes, and all are persuaded that they really see the miracle performed, no friendly voice calls on the multitude to listen to the simple faithful exposition of the blessed Volume which the priests conceal from their inspection. Even if it were true, as some have said, that the comment will supply the place of the Bible itself, what improvement can be expected where those who withhold the Bible withhold the comment also?

But, on the contrary, in Protestant countries, the value of preaching is recognised. In some cases, indeed, it may have been overvalued; such as, for instance, when it is preferred to the immediate worship of God. "My house is a house of prayer." But the mass of serious thinkers, without thus investing it with undue honours, properly consider it as a most important instrument in the hands of the church of God, and rest much of their hopes of the progress of the Gospel on its due and diligent application.

But though this truth has obtained pretty general acceptance as to the preaching of the lower orders of the clergy, the case of the heads of our church has been considered by some as widely different; and whilst even much and earnest preaching has been expected from their inferiors, the bishops have been consigned to comparative silence; and thus those whose rank would have invested their ministry with more influence than that of any other class, are the only persons privileged and even expected to be exempted from preaching. Such, however, is not the judgment of the author with whose name we have opened this review; and such, we may add, was not the judgment of his brother reformers. Latimer, in his somewhat homespun manner, declares, that if there were one vast gulph between Calais and Dover, it would not be large enough

to contain the *unpreaching bishops*. And the works of other early fathers of our church teem with exhortations to all classes of the clergy, and especially to the prelates, that they, like one of the earliest Christian bishops, would make full proof of their ministry, and give cause to the rejoicing multitude to exclaim, "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace, that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation!"

Nor are we able to discover any thing in the character of our own days, which can exempt the dignitaries of our venerable Establishment from the duty of taking a decidedly active and prominent part in the ministration of the word of God. There is indeed a kind of dignified selection, and self-reservation, which it may be expedient to exercise in fixing upon the time and place of preaching. The office should be obviously so undertaken, as best to promote the end desired; and it is possible to conceive a bishop surrendering something of the solemn dignity of his office, and thereby impairing its efficiency, by a too entire amalgamation of its duties with those of a parish priest. But this is plainly not the error into which the present generation of bishops are likely to fall. We wish sincerely to see them more engaged in a line of duty which, by giving them a more personal acquaintance with the duties of the ordinary clergy, will assist them better to discriminate between them; which will strengthen the hands, and, under God, give efficacy to the labours, of the clergy; which will, if their sermons be faithful transcripts of the Gospel, render the bishops, not merely the ornaments, but the strong and enduring pillars, of the Establishment. We have accordingly heard, with much satisfaction, a late rumour of the Bishop of Chester's having instituted a new service in his own diocese, of which he means himself, as often

as possible, to fulfil the ministerial duties. In like manner, it is impossible not to acknowledge, with the deepest gratitude, the zealous exertions of the Bishop of St. David's. And without alluding on the present occasion to others, our especial tribute of gratitude is due to the Right Rev. author of the sermons before us, who, as we have reason to know, adds, to the diligent and dignified discharge of his episcopal functions, the more humble though highly important labours of a parish priest. His lordship's zealous and disinterested exertions for our various charitable institutions are well known, and justly appreciated; and exposed as he has been, in a single instance, to a most unwarrantable attack on this subject, it is with much pleasure we have heard, that on a late public occasion, in the very city and scene of that attack, a distinguished member of his Majesty's government stood forward to avow his sense of the duty of steadily and ardently maintaining the cause of our religious institutions, thus clearing the government of an imputation, that a certain class of probationers for ecclesiastical preferment have most industriously laboured to fix upon it—that of approving the spirit and participating in the exertions of those who would check the great machine of public benevolence, and throw the world back into its former state of darkness and wretchedness. But it is more than time that we should turn from these general speculations, to the sermons immediately before us. They are three in number. The first was preached in the parish church of Dursley, on the occasion of introducing a new organ. The Bishop, having given an account of the introduction of musical instruments into places of Divine worship, and shewn satisfactorily that the antipathy of certain orders

of good men to instrumental music in public worship is ill founded, turns to the more important subject of the spirit with which alone we can acceptably approach the Divine Majesty, when thus singing our songs to the stringed instruments in the house of our God. In describing the state of heart essential to the right discharge of this duty, we find the following passage, which we insert as giving a brief abstract of the Bishop's opinions on some highly important topics.

“The characteristic properties of this state are the following:

“First. The soul has been thoroughly and affectingly convinced of its own inbred and actual sinfulness, its own positive helplessness in the sight of God. A comparison of the record of conscience with the standard of the Divine law, ‘holy, just, and good,’ has compelled it to exclaim with the Scripture, ‘In me dwelleth no good thing;’ and with our Scriptural Liturgy, ‘There is no health in me.’ ‘The burden of my sins is intolerable.’ I am in myself incapable of atonement for the past, and of radical improvement for the future.—Under these convictions the soul has reached the first step in its religious progress, and gladly springs forward under the conduct of Divine influence to the second. In such a state, she verifies the assertion of the Scripture: once she thought herself whole, in no need of the Physician; now she knows and confesses her sickness. Thus self-abased, the penitent is ready to embrace with his whole heart, as specially appropriate to his own case, the fundamental truth, that ‘Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.’ He feels and owns, that, if he can entertain any hope of salvation, it must spring entirely from the application of this truth in all its particulars to himself, and that on this foundation alone he may securely repose. For me, he desires to say, Christ fulfilled the law. For me he endured a life of woe, and a cross of propitiation. To me he offers the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit. For my pardon, my conversion, my edification, he makes intercession from hour to hour; and he will be ready, if I be but truly united with him, to present me blameless at the great day of account, washed clean in his blood, justified by his righteousness.

"Thus fully appreciating his own personal necessities, and the exact suitability and sufficiency of his love of Christ, as a supply for those necessities, as a remedy for his disease, he desires, in the last place, above all things to ascertain practically his own personal interest in that redeeming love, and to shew forth his sense of its value, his share in its effects. He falls into no awful error, no snare of Satan respecting the nature of Christ's redemption: he is well assured that He will save his people, not in but from their sins; and is therefore satisfied with no evidence of his own interest in Him, but an increasing hatred of sin, a deeper sorrow for its commission, a quicker sensibility to its approach, a more successful resistance to temptation, a more earnest longing for purity of heart, a stronger faith, and a warmer love to God and man, abundant in every good word and work, in every duty of private and social life. He discerns these evidences under much human infirmity becoming gradually clearer, his hope of full adoption by his heavenly Father strengthens by degrees, and his prospect of an immortal inheritance brightens as he advances. He becomes more and more strongly persuaded, that without Christ he was nothing, and far worse than nothing; but at the same time he acquires the humble but firm assurance, that in Christ he can do and may have all things, 'wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.'" pp. 18—20.

The second sermon was preached at the cathedral church of Gloucester, for the benefit of the Clerical Charity, upon the occasion of the triennial meeting of the three choirs. It is founded on the contributions of the Christians in Macedonia and Achaia, "for the poor saints which are at Jerusalem." This charity being designed for the widows and orphans of the clergy, the Bishop is naturally led to touch upon the clerical office and character. We have been much gratified by the following passage on this subject, and we earnestly pray, that such ministers may rapidly multiply in our churches.

"Bring before your eyes another scene, which we trust that many a husband and father of these petitioners has exhibited in reality—the Christian pastor in the discharge of his various momentous duties, his labours of love. Behold him introducing, in his baptismal office, your infancy into the body of the church; initiating your childhood in the rudiments of Gospel truth; training your youth in godly discipline to habits of piety and virtue, and to that further proficiency in religious knowledge which may fit you, under Divine grace, for the benefits of the apostolical rite, Confirmation, and gradually leading you on to understand, to appreciate, to desire, and to share the consummation of Christian ordinances, the supper of our Lord. Behold him, the oracle of your manhood in each case of spiritual difficulty, the mild but watchful reprovcr of your errors, the ready but discreet encourager of your better thoughts, your heavenward affections; in public and in private, ever diligent and conscientious in inculcating the precepts of Christian obedience, and in urging you to embrace the privileges of Christian faith; opening on the one hand the salutary demands and awful penalties of the law, and on the other the unsearchable riches of Jesus Christ, pardon, grace, and glory. Behold him again, in your seasons of affliction and sickness, in your comfortless declining age, and at your fearful bed of death—the friend at hand, perhaps the only friend and comforter, administering, in exact proportion to your wants, counsel and consolation, such as the well-instructed scribe can bring forth from his scriptural treasure, such as may prove in you 'a well of water springing up unto everlasting life.' Behold him such to all, to the learned and the unlearned, to the rich and the poor; and if we may use the term in a human sense, the peacemaker and mediator of mutual love between the one and the other, the awakener of charitable feeling in the rich, the regulator and distributor of their gifts, the dispenser of these to the poor for their bodily relief, with a never-failing call to heartfelt gratitude and spiritual improvement. Thus behold him in each function of his ministerial office, 'alluring you to brighter worlds,' and in each branch of his personal character 'himself leading the way,' the pattern of the Christian's spirit, and of the Christian's walk. Behold him thus, continuing 'instant in season and out

of season,' persevering, in steady consistency, in patient hope, amidst trials within and without, perhaps amidst reproach and neglect, and certainly amidst the embarrassments of present poverty, and the apprehensions of impending want for those whom he must leave behind. Behold him, at length, after the labours of such a ministry—labours perhaps aggravated by inadequate support—yielding his soul to his God at his appointed time, and bequeathing his bereaved widow and orphans to that free mercy of his heavenly Father, which he cannot claim, as a debt, but on which he relies as a promise, and to that charitable attention of his flock to which he has surely a right and ample title, grounded, as we have seen, upon the strongest bonds of obligation, and sanctioned, may I not now say, by the responsive feelings of every grateful heart in this congregation," pp. 38—40.

The third sermon was also preached in the cathedral at Gloucester, on the 4th of January, 1818, the first Sunday of the new year; and is designed chiefly to consider the causes of our reluctance to look back on the passages and events of our life—on the danger of this reluctance—and on some of the national events which it becomes us especially to call to mind. We present our readers with the following passage on the death of our deeply-lamented Princess, because we feel an anxiety, of which indeed we have already given full proof, that our pages should contain a specimen of all those effusions of pious grief and exhortation which her untimely fate has wrung from the hearts of the ministers and friends of religion.

"Again, As if to try each resource of his administration, the Lord strives to compel, by his terrors, those whom he could not win by his mercy. He 'takes away from us the desire of our eyes with a stroke.' The double hope of long reigns of singular usefulness and happiness is plunged in one common tomb. The cause is more than usually mysterious, and thus affords a special evidence of its being His work, whose ways are 'past finding

out.' We are 'stricken,' (if we may venture to apply expressions consecrated, as it were, to the vicarious sufferings of the Son of God,) 'smitten of God, and afflicted.' There is no want of feeling now—the nation suffers, as one man, and mourns with one heart and one voice. But what has been the practical result? Have we connected the providential chastisement with our national sins? Have we humbled ourselves under the mighty hand of God, and sought to improve this revelation of his righteous wrath into an awakening summons to newness of life? Or has it not been too generally the sorrow of 'the natural man,' which passeth away like the early dew, a vague and general feeling without exciting personal interest or producing self-application? Has it not left the world of nominal Christians just as it found them, just as ready to be entangled and absorbed in their former cares and corruptions; just as devoted to their dissipated pleasures; just as far from God, and at enmity with him; just as regardless of real happiness in this life; just as unprepared for death and eternity? Does not the land still mourn on account of the prevalence of vice in our streets, the neglect of God in our families, and the profanation of the Sabbath for pleasure or for gain?" pp. 54—56.

Another important characteristic of the year is thus noticed :

"A singular characteristic of the year may not even have attracted our attention, but it deserves notice in itself, and may be turned to good account in reviving our recollection of pre-eminent spiritual privileges, which we have long possessed, and in prompting a strict examination of the profit which we are now making of these ten talents entrusted to our care.

"Just three hundred years have elapsed since Luther, the captain of the Reformation, burst asunder the bonds of papal thralldom, and commenced the war of religious liberty, and of the truth as it is in Jesus, against 'principalities and powers, and the rulers of the darkness of this world; against spiritual wickedness in high places.' The day then broke, the fire was then kindled, which, in a few years, reached this country, dispersed the mists and vapours which defiled and deformed the face of primitive religion amongst us, and raised that flame of scriptural, spiritual truth, and of pure

devotion, which informs and guides our faith in the Articles and Homilies, which warms and animates our affections in the Liturgy of the Church of England. Such an anniversary was surely the chosen time, the appropriate period, for reviewing and proving our doctrinal sentiments—the tone and standard of our religious views, principles, and habits, and for bringing them to the test of the primitive orthodoxy and the primitive zeal of the Reformation.

“Deliverance from the yoke of papal tyranny and the burden of papal superstition did not form the whole, or even the chief part of the blessed change, which our God wrought for us through his chosen instruments, the Reformers. The dethronement of Jesus Christ from his sole office of Mediator between God and man by the introduction of angels, and even saints, as his coadjutors and colleagues, the doctrine of self-righteousness or justification by works, and the substitution of mere outward worship for spiritual religion, of the form of godliness for the power of it, and of a system of compromises and reservations for genuine universal holiness of heart and life;—these were the capital fundamental errors of the papal system;—these were the chief sources and instruments of the wide-wasting desolation and depravity, which it diffused over many whole communities, and even over a quarter of the globe, from generation to generation.

“It has been well styled, so far as doctrine was concerned, the religion of corrupted human nature, subverting all that the Gospel has done for us, and, in effect, reducing us again to our natural ignorance of God, and to the dominion of our natural propensities and evil passions.

“In direct opposition to these corruptions, Luther and his followers, the reformers of our church, built again the whole foundation of their spiritual edifice upon the apostolical basis, even Jesus Christ. On Him, the Rock of ages, on his blood, his intercession, his grace, and his righteousness, they rested exclusively and entirely the hope of the Christian in life, in death, in judgment, in eternity. One of them is said to have borne his dying testimony at the stake to this radical and saving truth, exclaiming, ‘None but Christ, none but Christ!’

“In furtherance of the same views they

completely excluded all human works and human merit from any share in the office of justification before God. They made thus, according to the scriptural metaphor, the Apostle Paul their chief pillar, as his and their Saviour was their head ‘corner-stone, elect, precious.’” pp. 56—59.

The following practical questions are founded upon this statement.

“Do we, or do we not, perceive from time to time symptoms of degeneracy from the faith thus once delivered to the saints, and a tendency to relapse into the papal corruption of self-justification, however abhorred in name, yet too often approved in deed? Is it not a severe and sometimes an unsuccessful struggle to keep the claim of works wholly out of the justifying office; and will they not often intrude under some unscriptural name or shape, and usurp a place, where Christ should be all in all?—And again, Is it never a mitigated law and a lowered standard of holiness, the obedience to which we are apt to admit, as genuine and sufficient evidence of saving faith? Do we never allow the name of religion to that attendance upon outward ordinances, united with freedom from proscribed vices, which our forefathers of the Reformation would have characterized as formality? Do we never permit compliances and conformity with the world, which they would have branded with the title of sinful declensions, and proofs of a heart not right with God? Are we not, in short, in doctrine and in practice, far from living up to our privileges, and too much inclined to sink below the exalted principles, and to fall short of the spiritual graces, which the founders of our reformed church taught in their writings, exemplified in their lives, sealed with their blood, and still inculcate and enjoin in our Articles, Homilies, and Liturgy, the statute-book, if I may so call it, of our national religion? This very city, once blessed with the godly example and apostolical ministry of a Hooper, once the scene of his martyrdom for the truth; would, I must fear, and I would speak in personal conviction and personal acknowledgment, bear witness to the comparative decline of our piety and remissness of our zeal.” pp. 60—62.

Such are all the extracts from these discourses which our limits will allow us to make. Our readers will, however, perceive from these, what

they are to expect from the Sermons themselves. They are plain, practical discourses, of much simplicity, good sense, feeling, benevolence, strict in their adherence to the spirit and letter of Scripture, and carefully constructed with a view to carry the hearer's mind beyond mere local and less important objects, to those higher objects and considerations on which our everlasting happiness is suspended. Some of the arguments, as, for instance, that on the use of church music, and that on the benevolence of the early Christians, are carefully pursued.

But the general character of the Sermons is evidently rather that of affectionate persuasion than of elaborate argument. We can well believe, that there must be a perpetual struggle in the mind of an individual, so incessantly and usefully employed as the Bishop of Gloucester, whether he shall present only that which is elaborate and finished to the public, or shall yield himself to the ever-multiplying demands of benevolence and piety. And, certainly, we should be very sorry to see him employing his important hours in stringing metaphors and balancing periods, when, by throwing the weight of his presence and co-operation into the hesitating scale, he may decide the wavering cause of truth, and give religion its due preponderance in the public esteem. A person in ordinary life can little judge what individuals thus circumstanced have both to do and to resist. We cannot, however, but perceive that they have to bear up against their full measure of calumny, suspicion, and misrepresentation; against the disingenuous silence of some, and the worse than silence of others. To God and themselves alone are known the difficulties which arise from circumstances like these, cumbered as they will be with those workings of the fallen heart which are common to us all. Let, however, such individuals "trust

in the name of the Lord, and stay upon their God." Let them say, in the words of Hooker, "I have a Shepherd full of kindness, full of care, and full of power—unto Him I commit myself."

And if, after drinking at these sources of heavenly consolation, they can stoop to taste of those which human love and gratitude supply, let them assure themselves that they are surrounded by the affections of not a few of the worthiest and best of their fellow-countrymen; that their sacrifices are justly and feelingly estimated; and that many a wish and prayer ascends daily to the Throne of Mercy, for their peace, and prosperity, and eternal happiness.

The Two Grand Instruments for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Duty of Christians to uphold them with Zeal and Energy: a Sermon preached at St. Mary's, Aylesbury, at the Second Annual Meeting of the Aylesbury District Committee of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge; and also at the Establishment of the District Committee, at Bentinck Chapel. By the Rev. BASIL WOODD, M. A. of Trinity College, Oxford, Rector of Drayton Beauchamp, Bucks, and Minister of Bentinck Chapel, St. Mary-le-bone. London: Bridge-water. pp. 42.

"I HAVE lived," said the expiring Hooker, "to see that the world is made up of perturbations;"—a sentiment in which, we are sorry to say, we have but too much reason to concur. When, especially, we look to the Christian Church—and, we may even add, when we revert to our own pages, and see how considerable a portion of them we are obliged, for the sake of the interests of truth, to occupy in controversy—we cannot but experience sensations of the most melancholy

kind. Glad, therefore, are we to turn from subjects of a polemical nature to those topics on which all genuine Christians are agreed; and with greater satisfaction still do we witness the instances which, we are happy to say, bad as things are, do occasionally occur, of men who are content to handle even controversial subjects in a practical and devotional spirit, and to shew, that if all Christians cannot agree, they can at least differ without any breach of mutual kindness and charity.

The Sermon before us is an illustration of this pleasing kind. The reverend writer is well known as an active and useful clergyman, and as a strenuous advocate for the prominent charitable societies which have been made the subject of much useless, and we might perhaps say unhallowed, controversy. We here find him, as a District Secretary of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, advocating the cause of that excellent institution; without affecting a studied forbearance, much less evincing a positive hostility, towards other societies. This is as it ought to be; and we wish we could add, such as in point of practice it is usually found.

In reviewing, some months since, (vide Christian Observer for August, 1817,) a sermon by the Rev. John Matthew, we remarked, that single sermons, and especially charity sermons, are not usually of sufficient importance to demand an express notice in the limited space which we are able to afford to this department. We however thought that gentleman's sermon deserving of our attention, partly on account of its being a most curious specimen of divinity in itself, and partly, and indeed chiefly, from the circumstance of its having been preached before, and recommended by, a District Committee of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. The former claim, it is true, does not apply to the discourse now before us; which

is a plain but highly respectable one, of an expository and practical kind: but the latter claim it possesses in full force, having been originally delivered by the reverend author, as secretary to the Aylesbury District Committee, of which the Bishop of Lincoln is president, and being printed at their request. Having therefore been reluctantly obliged to notice with disapprobation a sermon coming before us with the peculiar recommendation which Mr. Matthew's possessed, we feel much pleasure in making the *amende honorable* by bringing forward another discourse, under similar circumstances, to which we can give a very sincere and cordial approbation. We trust that, in future, Bridgewater will condescend to take a lesson from Aylesbury.

Mr. Woodd has chosen for his text Acts viii. 30, 31: *And Philip ran thither to him, and heard him read the prophet Esaias, and said, Understandest thou what thou readest? And he said, How can I except some man should guide me?* From the history of which this passage forms a part, Mr. Woodd considers, first, the "*grand means*," and secondly, the "*sublime object*," of Christian instruction. The narrative is certainly well calculated for affording an answer to both these points, and the author has fairly availed himself of the circumstances mentioned in it, without overstating or straining them, to suit his purpose. There are few modes of preaching more generally useful and acceptable to an auditory than this. The illiterate cannot, and will not, attend to an argument of much precision or difficulty; nor will the literate be always inclined to stoop to a mere hortatory and common-place strain of free remark. But a narrative sermon never fails to interest the former; and, if well digested, if all the points of improvement be fairly and seasonably deduced, if there be no appearance of effort to prove or illustrate what was never intended

to be proved or illustrated by the circumstances under consideration, such a sermon will, generally speaking, be as useful and interesting to the rich and fastidious as even to the former class. Mr. Woodd thus introduces his subject :—

“ An Ethiopian, a man of civil rank and authority, desirous to know and receive Divine truth, had taken a long journey of some thousand miles to Jerusalem, in order to worship the One true and living God. The extent of sandy desert, which he had probably crossed, the anxiety, expense, inconvenience, and fatigue, which he must unavoidably have experienced, afford us the strongest conviction of his piety, zeal, and desire of instruction. The fame of the temple of Jehovah had probably reached the interior of Africa, and interested many to know the character of a religion, which professed to be a revelation descended from above, and which distinguished the Jews from all other nations on the face of the earth. He had joined in the worship at Jerusalem, had obtained a portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, and was now returning to his native land. It appears, by the sequel, that it was requisite that he should understand the way of God more perfectly. Divine Providence had conducted him to Jerusalem, introduced him to the Court of the Gentiles, and put into his hands the sacred Records: still there was need of further instruction, and therefore an Evangelist is, by explicit revelation, directed to accost him, and to explain to him, more distinctly, the Christian method of Redemption, and the distinguished truths of the everlasting Gospel.

“ Accordingly we read that ‘ the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Arise, and go towards the south, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert. And he arose and went: and, behold, a man of Ethiopia, an Eunuch of great authority, under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, who had the charge of all her treasure, and had come to Jerusalem for to worship, was returning, and, sitting in his chariot, read Esaias the prophet. Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.’ The instance here recorded, must by no means be pleaded as an encouragement to regard internal impressions, or impulses of mind, as criterions of faith, or directories

of conduct. St. Philip lived in the age of miracles. It is expressly recorded, ‘ The angel of the Lord spake unto him.’ It was a direct revelation, an immediate suggestion from above; but, under the present dispensation, we have no scriptural authority to expect such communications. To consider any impressions on the imagination as arguments of faith, or directions of pursuit, would involve us in those mazes of enthusiasm, which have always proved dangerous, and in some instances fatal. Our rule of duty is the written word of God. Let us walk by this light of the Lord” pp. 4—6.

From the circumstances of the narrative, Mr. Woodd justly shews, first, the importance of the holy Scriptures as a means for the propagation of the Gospel; and then, the necessity of the Christian ministry as a second means.

“ Although this nobleman possessed and read the word of God, he acknowledged that he could not understand the sacred writings without an instructor. This his reply to the Evangelist confesses. When St. Philip addressed him, ‘ Understandest thou what thou readest?’ he instantly replies, as if rather surprised at the inquiry, ‘ How can I except some man should guide me?’ On this he desired St. Philip to come up and sit with him and instruct him. His incapacity to understand without an instructor again appears by a subsequent inquiry (verse 25), ‘ I pray thee, of whom speaketh the prophet this? Of himself, or of some other man?’

“ It is not by this observation presumed to insinuate, that the holy Scriptures are not able to make wise unto salvation, or that the obviously plain and practical part of the Divine word does not contain the detail of truths essentially necessary to eternal life, or that the Holy Spirit of God may not, independent of human agency and of the ministry of the church, open the eyes of the understanding to understand the Scriptures; but the observation is simply designed to state, that, generally speaking, it is by the concurrent aid of the ministry of the church, together with the inspired word, that men are brought to understand, and cordially to receive the truths of God. Thus it is written by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, ‘ How shall

they hear without a preacher? How shall they preach except they be sent? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.' The great Head of the church hath constituted and ordained the Christian ministry for this very important purpose, to administer the holy sacraments ordained by Christ himself, to maintain the discipline, doctrine, and duties of the Christian society, and to explain as a faithful steward and interpreter the words of eternal life. To this effect the words of our ascending Redeemer point out the dignity and commission, and enjoin the duty of the ministers of his sanctuary, 'Go ye and teach all nations. Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature.' pp. 11, 12.

Having thus pointed out the two grand instruments for the promotion of the Gospel—namely, the holy Scriptures and the Christian ministry—Mr. Woodd proceeds to shew the "sublime object" to which both these means are intended to have reference. He considers the object of both to be, "to testify the Gospel of the grace of God." This he illustrates by that part of the narrative which states, that St. Philip "began at the same Scripture and preached unto him Jesus."

"When it is recorded in the history, that St. Philip opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus, surely we may consider this part of the narrative as an inspired testimony to the identity of the prophecy with the person of our Lord, and comprising a compendium of Divine truth; as establishing a standard as the grand object of all religious societies, and the sum and substance of the ministry of the church of Christ." pp. 14, 15.

From a general review of the subject, Mr. Woodd derives three inferences:—1. The respect and reverence due to the Scriptures and the ministry of the church of Christ: 2. The pointed reproof which the example of the Ethiopian eunuch (who though an officer of state, and probably engaged in numerous employments, found means to go to Jerusalem to worship,) reflects upon the inattentive and negligent Christian; and, 3. The great encouragement presented by the history to the faithful and laborious minister of Christ, of whom he remarks:

lem to worship,) reflects upon the inattentive and negligent Christian; and, 3. The great encouragement presented by the history to the faithful and laborious minister of Christ, of whom he remarks:

"His services may often appear contracted, his sphere of usefulness circumscribed, and his talents occupied to little effect. Yet in the sequestered scene of a small parish, obscure, and apparently unknown, his work is still with his God, and his reward is still with Him: not only so; his labours may be far more important than in the ensnaring sphere of popular estimation. He may still be accomplishing far more good than he suspects, and the bright result of his apparently humble labours may be extensive and glorious far beyond his calculation.

"St. Philip preached, in this instance, in a desert, to a single individual; but the reward of his labour was not only the conversion of an heathen to the faith of Christ, but the establishment of a Christian church, which continued for many ages.

"Are these the important benefits, which may attend faithful exertions? Is it possible that our humble endeavours may prove extensively beneficial? Then let us take compassion on those who have neither the holy Scriptures, nor the Christian ministry, nor the faithful pastor to preach to them Christ Jesus the Lord." pp. 24, 25.

"Whatever difficulty may attend the discussions of controversial theology, the practical truth is sufficiently plain, that the duty of man, and the blessing of God, are invariably connected. 'Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, for it is God which worketh in you to will and to do of his good pleasure.' Nor is there more difficulty in this contemplation than is constantly exhibited in the natural world. It is the duty of man to cultivate the field, to sow the seed, and carefully to protect the plant; but it is God, who imparts the principle of vegetation, and causeth the earth to bring forth fruit in due season." p. 22.

The general application of the subject to the venerable institution for which Mr. Woodd was pleading is too obvious to need detail. His at-

tachment to the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, and his exertions in its behalf, are well known; and we are, perhaps, the more pleased at the fact, from the circumstance that he is also the secretary of the Society for the Conversion of the Jews, as well as an active member of the Society for Propagating the Gospel, and of the Bible and Church Missionary and other Societies. We imagine that Mr. Woodd and other gentlemen, who are members of two or more of these institutions, act upon the principle, that one grand miscellaneous society is desirable and necessary for the various, though closely connected objects of schools, missions, the distribution of Bibles, Prayer-books, and tracts, &c. &c.; but that at the same time, when the numerous advantages resulting from the division of labour are duly considered, it becomes not less expedient that there should be likewise specific institutions for each of these benevolent purposes. The happy effects of this plan are now exhibited on a large and increasing scale. The National Society has devoted itself to the affair of education; the Bible Society to the distribution of the Scriptures; the Prayer-book and Homily Society to the diffusion of the formularies of the church; the Church Missionary Society to the promotion of Christian knowledge and Church-of-England principles among the heathen at large; the Society for Propagating the Gospel to the same objects in America; the Church Tract Society to the publication of tracts connected with the doctrines and discipline of the church;—while, amidst all, the parent society in Bartlett's Buildings, so far from having her patrimony diminished, by seeing so many of her younger sisters handsomely portioned out, has been increasing in wealth, and usefulness, and efficiency, in proportion to the success of other institu-

tions; and still presents, in case of the eventual failure of any one or more of these societies, a means of repairing, to no inconsiderable extent, the deficiency occasioned by such an occurrence.—“Sirs, ye are brethren: why do ye wrong one to another?”

In the Appendix to the Sermon, Mr. Woodd takes the opportunity of stating the “powerful claims” of the Bible Society, and expresses his great satisfaction and pleasure at the success of that institution. He also strenuously recommends the objects, and eulogizes the labours, of the elder society. As the tracts of the latter are very numerous, it may not be useless to such of our readers as have not a sufficient opportunity of making a selection to present them with the following note from Mr. Woodd's discourse, in which he mentions some of those which he has found in practice most generally useful.

“Among these the Christian reader will find the excellent tracts, entitled Scougal's *Life of God in the Soul of Man*;—Burkitt's *Help and Guide to Christian Families*;—*The Cottager's Religious Meditations*;—Mr Broughton's *Christian Soldier*;—Bishop Bradford, on *Baptismal and Spiritual Regeneration*, &c.—The youth and child will be at once edified and delighted with Jones's *Book of Nature*;—Bishop Kenn's and the Oxford Exposition of the *Catechism*;—Bishop Kenn's *Manual for Winchester Scholars*;—Dr. Woodward's *Young Man's Monitor*;—*Chief Truths*;—*Funeral Sermon on Lord Rochester*;—Bishop Porteus's *Evidences*;—Archdeacon Pott's *Elementary Discourses*, &c. Many others might be mentioned: the above are specified, because the writer has distributed great numbers of them with satisfactory evidence of their good effect. He could mention instances, in which they instilled the first efficient principles of practical religion; and he records it with gratitude both to God and the pious author, that two of his own family, who, he humbly hopes, are now in joy and felicity, received, at the age of eight years, their first impressions of the excellence of Divine truth, from reading the excellent Bishop Kenn's *Manual*.” p. 31.

P
C
do
by
G
ph
vi
of
me
by
an
Th
Gr
an
lec
Ho
scr
of
tion
Ins

I
Joh
of
Lei
pist
Chu
Pap
W.
side
by I
Rom
Ban
duri
lum
Ettr
Pyth
T. T
the I

T
dis
naus
reck
In 17
1806
reck

LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE, *&c. &c.*

GREAT BRITAIN.

PREPARING for publication:—Indian Church History, &c. by T. Yeates;—"London before the great Fire," in Numbers, by Messrs. Boydell;—Code of Political Economy, by Sir John Sinclair;—Bibliophilia, by John Fry;—Brussels and its Environs, by J. Romberg;—The Commerce of the World, by the Editor of "The Commercial Dictionary;"—Poems and Tales, by Mrs. Lamont;—Sermons on the Offices and Character of Jesus Christ, by the Rev. Thomas Bowdler;—Memoirs of the late Granville Sharpe, Esq. from his own MSS. and other authentic Documents, with a Selection from his Correspondence by Prince Hoare; with Observations on Mr. Sharpe's scriptural Criticisms, &c.; by the Bishop of St. David's; (to be published by subscription, and the profits devoted to the African Institution.)

In the press:—Sermons, by the Rev. John Marriott;—Treatise on the Covenant of Grace, by Rev. Dr. Colquhoun, of Leith;—Life of Howard, the Philanthropist, by Mr. Brown;—The Apostacy of the Church of Rome, and the Identity of the Papal Power with the Man of Sin, &c. by W. Cuninghame, Esq.;—Journal of a Residence in Iceland during 1814 and 1815, by Dr. Henderson;—The civil History of Rome till the Time of Augustus, by Henry Bankes, Esq. M. P.;—A View of Europe during the middle Ages, by Henry Valium;—The Brownie of Bodstock, by the Ettrick Shepherd;—Jamblicus's Life of Pythagoras, translated from the Greek, by T. Taylor;—The Traveller's Guide down the Rhine, by A. Schreiber.

The number of known vegetable species discovered since the year 1763, when Linnaeus published his *Species Plantarum*, and reckoned them at only 7500, is remarkable. In 1784, Murray raised them to 9600. In 1806, M. Person included 21,000, without reckoning cryptogamous plants, which

may be estimated at 6000 more. M. Decandolle has made assiduous researches, and finds the number increased in an extraordinary manner: so that, it would appear, the whole number now exceeds 50,000.

Russia.—The Emperor Alexander, it is said, has lately appointed the celebrated Count Kotzebue to edit an immense work, to be circulated in every part of the empire, and be publicly read by the clergy, which is to embrace the substance of all the works printed in Europe, on politics, statistics, manufactures, public instruction, &c. He is to employ as many presses as he may deem necessary. A munificent salary is attached to the appointment, and the Count is allowed to reside in any part of Russia or Germany, as he shall find to be most advantageous for the prosecution of his labours.

Vaccination.—A most satisfactory Report has been presented to the National Institute of France, from Messrs. Berthollet, Percy, and Halle, relative to the effects of vaccine inoculation. After making due allowances for false variolous symptoms, the reporters had discerned but six cases in which small pox had occurred after vaccination, and even these were not entirely free from doubt. There was only one case of a girl in Paris, who, having been vaccinated in a complete manner, was afterwards attacked by the small pox. In this case the disease, which occurred about two years after the vaccination, was mild and favourable. Against these seven cases they oppose two millions and upwards of persons in all parts of the world, who are attested to have employed this remedy with complete success. They further state their opinion, that vaccination has in very few cases been followed by disease or constitutional injury; that, on the contrary, it often *benefits* the constitution, and almost always mitigates glandular complaints.

LIST OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

THEOLOGY.

A General Index to the Matters contained in the Notes to the Family Bible, lately published under the Direction of the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge. 4to. small, 3s.—large, 6s.

A Concordance to the Holy Bible: to which is added, a Geographical Index, adapted to the Maps and Notes of the Family Bible, and a Calendar and Table of Lessons. 4to. small paper, 4s.—large, 7s.

The Protestant Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, briefly celebrated as a Motive of National Gratitude; by the Rev. C. E. de Coetlogan, A. M. Rector of Godstone, Surrey. 8vo. 5s.

Lessons, Moral, Christian, and Patriotic. 1s. 6d.

A Sermon, preached in College-street Chapel, Edinburgh, on the Evening of Thursday, the 8th of May, 1817, on the Occasion of the fifth annual Meeting of the Congregational Union of Scotland; by R. Wardlaw. 1s. 6d.

Faith in the Holy Trinity the Doctrine of the Gospel, and Sabellian Unitarianism shewn to be "the God-denying Apostacy;" by the Rev. William Hales, D. D. Rector of Killesandra, &c. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 1s.

The Indian Pilgrim; or the Progress of the Pilgrim Nazarenee, formerly called Goonah Purist, or the Slave of Sin, from the City of the Wrath of God, to the City of Mount Zion; by Mrs. Sherwood. 4s.

The New Testament, translated by Dr. G. Campbell, Dr. P. Doddridge, and Dr. J. Macknight. 5s.

The Folly of Vice and Wisdom of Virtue: in two Discourses; by the late Rev. Biggin Broadbent, A. M.: to which is annexed, an Address delivered at his Interment; by the Rev. J. G. Robberds.

A Reply to the Rev. J. Kinghorn, being a further Vindication of the Practice of Free Communion; by the Rev. Robert Hall, A. M. 7s.

The Protestant's Catechism on the Origin of Popery, and on the Grounds of the Roman Catholic Claims: to which are prefixed, the Opinions of Milton, Locke, Hoadley, Blackstone, and Burke; with a Postscript on the Introduction of Popery into Ireland, by the Compact of Henry II. and Pope Adrian, in the twelfth Century; by the Bishop of St. David's. 8vo. 2s. 6d.

A Blow at the Root; or a Brief Account of the Rise and Growth of Antinomianism; by the late Rev. John Flavel: with an Appendix to prove that the Moral Law is a Rule of Life to Believers.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Antiquities of Athens, measured and delineated; by J. Stuart, F.R.S. &c. and Nicholas Revett, Painters and Architects; edited by Jos. Woods, Architect. Vol. IV. imp. folio, 77. 7s.

The Elgin Marbles, from the Temple of Minerva at Athens; selected from Stuart and Revett's Antiquities of Athens: to which is added, an Historical Account of the Temple, in sixty engravings. 4to. 57. 5s.

Memoirs of John Evelyn, Esq. the celebrated Author of the Sylva; by W. Bray, Esq. with many engravings. 2 vols. 4to.

A Metrical Guide to the right Intelligence of Virgil's Versification; by John Carey, LL.D. 3s.

A Guide in the Selection and Use of Elementary School Books, in every Branch of Education: by the Rev. Joshua Collins; corrected to the present Time by the Rev. W. Catlow. 1s.

Scenes in Europe; by ——— Taylor. 12mo. 4s. plain, 6s. coloured.

Tales for my Sons; by M. Kotzebue. 6s.

History of British India; by James Mill, Esq. with maps by Arrowsmith. 3 vols. 4to. 67. 6s.

The Northern Courts; containing original Memoirs of the Sovereigns of Sweden and Denmark, since 1766: including the extraordinary Vicissitudes of the Lives of the Grand-children of George II.; by John Brown, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. 17. 1s.

Part II Vol. VI. of the Transactions of the Horticultural Society of London, with nine engravings. 4to. 17. 1s.

Remarks on the Medical Care of the Parochial Poor: with a few Observations on the Improvement of Poor-houses, and on the Necessity of establishing small Infirmarys in populous Towns; by J. C. Yeatman, Surgeon. 1s. 6d.

Adventures of a Post Captain; by a Naval Officer, with twenty-five plates, by Mr. Williams. Royal 8vo. 17. 4s.

The History of the Wars, from the French Revolution to the Battle of Waterloo; with plates. 2 vols. 8vo. 17.

A Review of Johnson's criticism on the Style of Milton's English Prose, with Strictures on the Introduction of Latin Idioms into the Language; by T. H. White, Esq. 2s. 6d.

Anti-Duello, or the Duell's Anatomie: a Treatise, in which is discussed the Lawfulness and Unlawfulness of single Combats: first printed in the Year 1632; with a Preface by the Editor, and an Appendix.

containing the Case of Lord Rea and Mr. Ramsey, and James Cluff: 8vo. 2s.

A History of Europe, from the Treaty of Amiens in 1802, to the Pacification of Paris in 1815; by Charles Coote, LL.D. 3vo. 12s.

A full and correct Account of the chief Naval Occurrences of the late War between Great Britain and the United States of America; by William James, Esq. 8vo. 1l.

Report of a Committee of the Linnean Society of New England, relative to a large Marine Animal, supposed to be a Serpent, seen near Cape Ann, Massachusetts, in August, 1817; reprinted verbatim from the Boston edition, with a large plate of the serpent. 8vo. 4s.

A Complete Analysis or Abridgment of

Dr. Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations; by Jeremiah Joyce. 6s.

Travels through some Parts of Germany, Poland, Moldavia, and Turkey; by Adam Neale, M. D. plates, 2l. 2s.

Narrative of an Expedition to explore the river Zaire, usually called the Congo, in South Africa, in 1816, under the Direction of Captain J. K. Tuckey, R. N.: to which is added, the Journal of Professor Smith, and an Appendix, containing the Natural History of that Part of the Kingdom through which the Zaire flows: 14 plates, 4to. 2l. 2s.

Travels of his Royal Highness the Duke of Angouleme through the Northern and South-west Departments of France, in Oct. and Nov. 1817. 8vo. with a portrait.

Letters on the West Indies, by James Walker. 7s.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

INCORPORATED SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.

It will afford unfeigned satisfaction to all who, according to the sublime language of our Church, devoutly pray that God will have mercy upon all Jews, Turks, Infidels, and Heretics; to be informed that this venerable Society is adopting very decisive measures for extending the knowledge of the Gospel to heathen nations. In the course of the last six weeks, three special meetings of the members have been summoned to take this important subject into consideration. These meetings were attended by the Most Rev. the Archbishops of Canterbury and York; the Right Rev. the Bishops of London, Gloucester, Ely, Exeter, Landaff, Norwich, Oxford, Peterborough, and Salisbury;— Lord Kenyon; the Deans of Westminster and Chester; Archdeacons Cambridge, Pott, and Watson; the Rev. Drs. Gaskin, Mant, Wordsworth, and Shackleford; the Rev. Messrs. G. D'Oyley, R. Lendon, H. H. Norris, Basil Woodd, &c.; Joshua Watson, Esq. &c.

The subject was introduced by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, with much personal interest, stated to the members the great importance of extending the missionary operations of the Society to the British territories in the East Indies and the island of Ceylon; under the juris-

diction and superintendence of the Bishop of Calcutta.

With much satisfaction we learn, that, after a short discussion, in which it was understood that no arrangements should interfere with the funds appropriated for the maintenance of ministers and catechists in the North American colonies, it was unanimously approved that the sum of 5000l. should be immediately placed at the disposal of the Bishop of Calcutta, and a correspondence opened with his lordship, for the purpose of carrying into effect the missionary objects of the Society.

The Bishops of London and Gloucester, and Joshua Watson, Esq., have been requested to draw up a Memorial upon the subject, to be presented to the Prince Regent by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, soliciting his Royal Highness to grant a royal mandate, or king's letter, addressed to the clergy of all the churches and chapels of the National Church, for a general collection in behalf of this important object.

The Bishops of London and Gloucester have also been requested by the Society to draw up an address to the clergy and the public, which is proposed to accompany the royal mandate, in order to stimulate the exertions of the country at large to unite in the propagation of the Gospel.

among the heathen nations under the British jurisdiction in India and Ceylon. It will give us unfeigned pleasure to hear of the progress of this truly religious and noble undertaking; and in the mean time, we cannot but congratulate our readers that the importance of Christian Missions is thus likely to be more than ever recognised and acknowledged by the nation at large, and particularly by our rulers and dignitaries in church and state. We are convinced that all other Missionary Societies will most cordially welcome the efforts of this venerable Corporation; and though, from the nature of its charter, it by no means supersedes the necessity for other exertions, yet its sphere, even construing that charter in the strictest manner, is so wide and important from the vast accessions to the British colonies during the last century, that we shall rejoice to find that the public liberality keeps pace with the magnitude of its projected operations.

WANT OF PLACES OF WORSHIP IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

At a time when the deficiency of churches in our own country is so severely felt, and the efforts both of the legislature and the public are employed to remove in some measure the evil, it may be interesting to our readers to learn the following particulars relative to the state of things in the United States of America. From a communication which we have just received from New York, we learn, that for the present population of that city, estimated at 120,000 souls, (which on account of the great increase, is considered to be much too low,) there are fifty-two places of worship, including those of all denominations. These are so unequally distributed, to say nothing of many of them being very small, that in one ward containing 12,000 persons there is but one place of worship, in another containing 13,000 thousand there are but three. It would appear, that only about one fourth of the population are in the habit of attending Divine service. The system of holding large seats, and refusing strangers admission into them when only partially filled, appears, from the account before us, to prevail not much less in New York than in England. The following is a list of the places of worship in a few other principal cities, taking the population of them at the last estimates:—

	Inhab.	Pls. of Worship.
Boston	36,000	23
New Haven	7,000	4
Philadelphia	120,000	42
Baltimore	60,000	32
Washington	8,208	4
Newburn	2,467	1
Charleston (S. C.)	30,000	18
Savannah	12,000	6

This deficiency may not at first sight appear very great, as compared with many of our own cities: but when it is considered that the list includes all the places of worship of every denomination, in very few of which are there to be found *two or three* ministers, as is the custom in large parishes in England, the deficiency will doubtless appear considerable; especially if we take into the account the rapid increase of population in America, to which the increase of churches is far from likely in every case to bear a due proportion.

UNITED STATES MISSION SCHOOL.

We have received another communication from New York announcing a plan for establishing a Missionary School. The object of this school is the education of heathen youth in such a manner as that, with future professional studies, they may be qualified to become missionaries, school-masters, interpreters, physicians, or surgeons, among heathen nations, and to communicate such information in agriculture and the arts, as shall tend to promote Christianity and civilization. Other youth of acknowledged piety may be admitted at their own expense, and at the discretion of the agents, so far as shall be consistent with the aforementioned object.

The students are to be instructed in spelling, reading and writing the English language; in English grammar, arithmetic, geography, and such other branches of knowledge as shall be deemed useful, at the discretion of the Principal, subject to the control of the Agents.

Exercises are to be instituted by the Principal, for the purpose of preserving to the students the knowledge of their respective languages.

Morning and evening prayers are to be attended daily in the school, accompanied with the reading of the Scriptures and the singing of psalms or hymns.

At the stated season of morning and evening prayers on the Sabbath, the Principal is to instruct the students in the leading truths of the Christian religion, and at such other times as the Agents shall judge expedient; and to see that the Students regularly attend public worship on the Sabbath.

The number of heathen who visit the United States is very great, as may be inferred from the fact, that there are at this time in New England no less than ten natives of the single island of Owhyhee. Savages are but two forward, in whatever country they land, to learn the vices of civilized life, and to carry them back to their countrymen on their return home. Early attention to the younger visitants of this description it is thought might succeed, in many cases, in infusing into their minds Christian habits and principles, and possibly in some instances in qualifying them

for becoming missionaries to their countrymen. Several young men from the Sandwich Islands have already been patronized in the United States by the bounty of benevolent individuals, who, fully satisfied with the result of the experiment, have thus ventured to bring the subject before the public on a larger scale.

The pamphlet which contains these particulars, gives also a very interesting narrative of five young men, from the Sandwich Islands, who are now receiving education in the United States. One of them, George Prince Tamoree, is heir apparent to the dominion of all the Sandwich Islands, the government of which is at present divided between his father and his uncle. All the five are converts to Christianity, and, with the exception of the prince, appear deeply in earnest respecting their salvation.

VIEW OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

THE war in India, we are concerned to find, has not yet closed. Our readers are aware, that the Peishwah some time since gave reason to suspect him of a plan for exciting a Mahratta war, and that, under these circumstances, he purchased peace by a cession of his forts, and promised to receive a British detachment into his capital. So just, it now appears, was this suspicion, that even after giving these securities, he has broken out into open hostility. On the 5th November, 40,000 of his troops, fought a battle with 4,000 British, who were hastily detached from Bombay against him. He was beaten both on that day, and again on the 17th, when he was totally put to flight. His capital fell into our hands. The confederacy of the native powers was found to be more extensive than had been imagined. By the last accounts, however, Scindia, the chief of the confederates, alarmed by the defeat of the Peishwah and the approach of the British forces, had signed a treaty very favourable to British interests, and had actually united his cavalry with ours, in order effectually to break the power of the Pindarrees. This we have no doubt will be accomplished.

Among the chief subjects of domestic occurrence during the last month, the steps taken in reference to the marriages of

the Royal Family must not be passed over unnoticed. On the 7th of April, her Royal Highness the Princess Elizabeth, the third daughter of their Majesties, was united to his Serene Highness the Prince of Hesse Homberg. The Prince of Hesse is well known as an officer of merit, and as having served in those great battles on the continent which have secured the present repose of Europe. He is general in chief of the cavalry of the Austrian empire. Her Royal Highness retains her annuity of 9,000*l.* per annum, and there will be no additional call upon the nation in consequence of the event.

Some other proceedings, however, of a similar kind have not arrived at an equally successful issue. On the 13th of April, messages were brought to both houses of parliament, from the prince regent, informing them, that negotiations had commenced with a view to the marriage of the duke of Clarence with the Princess of Saxe Meiningen; and of the duke of Cambridge with the Princess of Hesse, daughter of the late Landgrave, and niece of the reigning Elector. The messages further stated, that in consequence of the afflicting loss of his beloved and only child, the late Princess Charlotte, the prince regent felt assured that parliament would

see the propriety of making suitable provision in case of the marriage of his royal brothers. The ministry, in bringing forward a motion on this subject, which they considered to be one of the greatest political importance, seemed at first to wish to propose 19,500*l.* to the duke of Clarence, thus making his income 40,000*l.* per annum; and 12,000*l.* to the duke of Cambridge, which would raise his to 30,000*l.* The disapprobation, however, occasioned by this preliminary statement had the effect of reducing the sum proposed to 10,000*l.* for the duke of Clarence, and 6,000*l.* to the duke of Cambridge; with a similar sum in case of the marriage of the duke of Kent. The marriage of the duke of Cumberland, though rather of a private than a public nature, yet having received the royal approbation, ministers thought, ought to be placed on the same footing as those of the other princes of the blood. The grant of 6,000*l.* to the duke of Cambridge was carried by a large majority; but in reference to those proposed for the dukes of Clarence and Cumberland, considerable debates arose, which ended in parliament's declining to make *any* additional provision for the latter, and in their reducing the 10,000*l.* intended for the former to 6,000*l.* The principal argument urged for this reduction was the great pecuniary distress of the nation, which rendered it inexpedient to comply with the proposed grant. It was also considered that the royal dukes held offices which supplied other resources besides those granted by parliament; and a few hints were thrown out relative to the possibility and propriety of employing other funds more immediately belonging to the crown, for the assistance of their royal highnesses. It was intimated at the time, and was afterwards confirmed by an express message from the duke of Clarence himself, that this reduction in the sum proposed would have the effect of breaking off his intended marriage. It has however been since reported, though we know not on what authority, that his royal highness intends to persevere in his previous determination, availing himself of the alternative given by the royal marriage act of placing his union on the books of the privy council, thereby taking his chance of a future vote of approbation, dower, &c. Parliament has just voted a dower of 6,000*l.* per annum to the duchess of Cumberland,

in case of the death of his royal highness the duke.—Two subjects of extreme importance, both to individuals and the country, have been brought forward by the chancellor of the exchequer: we allude to the continuation of the bank restriction from cash payments, and certain intended regulations respecting private banking. The circumstances on which the chancellor of the exchequer grounded the necessity for a continuance of the restriction are chiefly the following: That owing to the deficiency of the harvest of 1816, (the harvest of 1817 not being greater than a general average one,) large quantities of corn had been imported, the payments for which had necessarily carried a considerable quantity of specie out of the country. The number of his majesty's subjects resident on the continent had added materially to the same effect. It appears, that from the treaty of peace in 1814 to February 1818, not less than 90,230 persons have embarked for the continent from the port of Dover alone; while the number of those who have returned, is only 77,530. The chancellor of the exchequer calculated the annual expenditure of these persons abroad, at not less than a million and half sterling; to which must be added the sums expended by our troops in France: for, notwithstanding the French government is pledged to support them, yet it is obvious that much private expense is incurred by the officers. But though these two circumstances appear of considerable importance, there is another which the right hon. gentleman viewed as requiring still more attention, namely, the transactions relative to foreign loans. In the course of the last two years the French government have raised 27,000,000*l.* sterling by loans, which have necessarily had the effect of rendering the exchange unfavourable to this country. The French government also professedly intend to raise 12,000,000*l.* sterling more this year; and in case of their wishing to make good the payments required by treaty previously to the withdrawing of the allied armies, not less than 20,000,000*l.* will probably be demanded. The chancellor of the exchequer has therefore stated, that although there have been political advantages resulting from these loans which prevented government from prohibiting British subjects voluntarily engaging in them; yet, considering the powerful effect which they have produced, in

drawing off the precious metals from this country, he conceived it a most hazardous measure to permit the Bank of England to return at the present moment to cash payments. He wished it, however, to be particularly understood, that he did not propose the continuance of the restriction in consequence of any internal circumstances in the affairs of the Bank itself, which he firmly believed was fully prepared to make good its payments in cash; but simply in consequence of those external circumstances, which, in his opinion, would render such an operation most unpropitious and dangerous at the present moment.

His second proposition is, to restrict private bankers in England and Ireland (the plan not extending to Scotland,) from issuing notes under 5*l.* without first depositing sufficient government securities; namely, either the amount in Exchequer Bills, or double the amount in Stock; in the hands of the commissioners for the redemption of the national debt. The notes issued under those conditions he proposes to be stamped in such a manner as to denote that sufficient security has been deposited. Five pound notes, and those for larger sums, are to remain as before on the personal security of the bankers who issue them. The bill, if passed, is not to be acted upon till July 5, 1820; nor will it apply to the Bank of England, which always possesses such a mass of government securities as completely to guarantee its creditors.

Our view of the questions connected with the state of our paper currency has been so often stated on former occasions, that our readers will be prepared both for our dissent from the doctrines laid down by the chancellor of the exchequer, and for our distrust of the remedies he has proposed. We believe the former to be founded in error, and the latter to be unjust to individuals, as well as inefficient to their professed purpose. If the real evil, be as we believe it to be, that the Bank of England have not sufficiently restrained their issues; and if to this cause, and this alone, is to be attributed the disappearance of a metallic currency, and the diminution in the value of Bank notes as compared with coin; then it is obvious, that the only effectual remedy is to be found in a restriction of those issues. But our limits restrain us from enlarging on the subject.

Christ. Observ. No. 196.

While we are on these subjects, we cannot but allude with the utmost pain to the alarming extent of the crime of forgery, particularly as respects the notes of the Bank of England. Within the last twenty-eight years, not less than 222 persons have been executed for forgery; of whom one-third were for forgeries on the the Bank of England. The temptations to the crime have necessarily arisen out of the state of the times, and the paper currency of the country. So far, therefore, no blame attaches to the Bank of England; but certainly a very general opinion has gone abroad, that its governors have not done all that was in their power to do to render their notes incapable of imitation. The subject has been introduced into parliament; and we understand that the Bank themselves are also taking it up, and examining plans proposed for their approbation. We shall therefore do no more than express our earnest hope that they will be able to succeed in checking an evil of such portentous magnitude. No pecuniary expense in the manufacture of their notes ought to be spared with a view to render them incapable of imitation by ordinary engravers. It is obvious, that if the small country bank notes are driven out of circulation, and Bank of England notes substituted, which must be the effect of the chancellor of the exchequer's measure, this evil cannot fail to increase.

The plan of finance for the service of the year has been proposed to parliament. The sum required is about 21,000,000*l.*; the expected receipts to meet it are a little more than 7,000,000*l.*: 14,000,000*l.* therefore remain to be made up. In case the sums raised by the plans proposed by the chancellor of the exchequer are not fully equal to the expenditure, the sinking fund will, if nothing preferable occurs, be charged to make good the deficiency. A new stock of 3 1-2 per cent. is to be created. The interest on this stock is not to be reduced, or the stock paid off for the next ten years. Every subscriber, on transferring 100*l.* three per cents. (reduced or consolidated,) to the account of the commissioners for reducing the national debt, and paying 11*l.* by instalments into the Bank, becomes entitled to 100*l.* of this new stock. The chancellor of the exchequer has publicly stated, that he hopes, perhaps as early as the next session of parliament, to reduce the four and five per cents.

2 N

OBITUARY.

COUNTESS OF LEVEN AND MELVILLE.

ON the 13th of February last, died, at Melville-house, Fife-shire, in the sixty-second year of her age, the Countess of Leven and Melville. She was the only daughter of the late John Thornton, Esq. of Clapham; and sister to the late Henry Thornton, Esq. of the same place;—names which will long be conspicuous in the records of piety and benevolence. Of a similar disposition and character was the subject of this brief memoir. She was remarkable through the whole of her life for kindness to the indigent. Many schools and associations for administering aid to the necessitous of different classes of persons, were materially indebted for their efficiency to her liberal patronage: and, what is particularly worthy of observation in a lady of her rank, she was constantly in the habit of visiting the poor in their own houses, and of ascertaining their wants by personal inquiry. Such conduct was naturally calculated to command veneration from all who have learnt to venerate what is good: and Lady Leven accordingly received from every rank of persons that large measure of respect to which she was so well entitled. But she was influenced by more exalted principles than this world can supply, and was doubtless conscious of a better approbation than the world can give.

The family into which Lady Leven married, and of which for some years she bore the title, had, like her own, been remarkable for the concern which it took in the interests of religion, and for its connexion with some of the most distinguished ministers of the last century. The intercourse which had thus been maintained with the more pious of the clergy by both branches of her family, was continued by herself; and whilst among her correspondents are to be found many such names as that of the late Rev. John Newton and some of the most eminent divines of the present day, little testimony can be wanted to shew how cordially she loved that Gospel which they taught, and how highly she regarded them, for their work's sake, as ministers of Jesus Christ.

It would much exceed the limits of this brief statement if we should enter into particular details, as exemplifying, in the char-

acter of Lady Leven, those qualities which constitute the essence of true religion. It may suffice to observe, that when the awful hour was approaching in which all principles must be brought to the test, she found that her hope was not a delusion; but that the religion, which she had embraced, had power to support her in the prospect of death, and could enable her to repose herself without anxiety either for time or for eternity upon the will of her heavenly Father. In one of her last letters to a near relation, she expresses herself in the following terms. "My God calls me to this trial, and thanks be to him I feel perfectly resigned to his will, and am far from being anxious for life. Indeed I cannot bring myself to pray for a recovery, but that I may submit to his will with patience and resignation. Oh! what a blessed change would it be, through the merits of my Redeemer and Saviour, to enter into that rest where there is no more sorrow or sighing."

Such was the state of her mind to the last hour of her existence. She was in possession of rank, but she looked not for comfort to earthly greatness. She was about to bid an eternal farewell to the dignity and fashion of the world, and she parted from them without regret. She had been an example of whatever is excellent and of good report in the various relations of life: but upon these things she fixed not her hope: her trust was in the merits of her Redeemer; and in reliance upon his promises, she looked beyond the sufferings of dissolution, to that rest which remaineth for the people of God.

Such are the triumphs of the Gospel of Christ! Such is the efficacy of true religion upon persons of every class, who experience its power! In the midst of affliction, it cherishes peace; and while the flesh and the heart are failing, it suggests, as in ancient times, the consoling assurance, "But God is the strength of my heart, and my portion for ever."

MISS LYDIA WAKEMAN.

Died, on Thursday, the 19th of March, Miss Lydia Wakeman, daughter of the late Thomas Wakeman, Esq. of Paradise Row, Worcester, aged 34 years. During

a long illness, which confined her many years to her chamber, Miss Wakeman was uniformly an eminent example of Christian faith, resignation, and patience. She was always employed, either for the good of others, or in cultivating the growth of religion in her own soul. Even in her state of pain and seclusion, she thought much of the poor; and, as long as she had strength, was exerting herself for their benefit. Her state of mind was at all times remarkably even and placid, which, under the peculiar nature of her disorder, tended greatly to alleviate her sufferings, and to prolong her life. She had an excellent memory; and it was well stored with Christian knowledge, derived chiefly from her Bible. This was to her an invaluable treasure, furnishing her with a rich source of contemplation during many a weary hour; and especially, during the latter weeks of her life, when she was no longer able to read that sacred volume. At this period, such was her love for the Word of God, that she would not allow it to be out of her sight. Its sacred truths were indeed in her "a well of water springing up into everlasting life." But her knowledge of the Scriptures, of other books which she had read, and particularly of sacred poetry, in which she took much delight, was an advantage and blessing not confined to herself alone; for, by a happy and judicious manner of introducing passages, when engaged in conversation, her discourse was rendered exceedingly interesting and instructive, and frequently made a deeply-serious impression. When so employed, nothing escaped her lips which had the least tincture of enthusiasm. Her piety was sound and scriptural: her thoughts were chastised and well regulated; the expression of them was in language easy and perspicuous: what she drew from the stores of her memory was always chaste, judicious, and well introduced; for she had not only warm devotional affections, but a good taste and a correct judgment.

Miss Wakeman was a sincere member of the Church of England. The Prayer-book was generally near her. She was very conversant with the Collects: indeed, no prayers did she deem so excellent as those which she found in that volume. A book in which she took particular delight was Archbishop Leighton's Commentary upon the First Epistle of St. Peter. The

spirit of Leighton seemed to be congenial with her own. She well knew how to value the excellent practical remarks, the devotional spirit, the ardent love of Christ, the clear exposition of the doctrines of the Gospel, the holy and spiritual influence, which are found in this author. When this book was first introduced to her, she expressed herself as if she had unexpectedly met with a delightful companion in her journey to heaven: and she often acknowledged how much she was indebted to him, under the Divine blessing, for increasing her desires after holiness and raising her affections above the world. A considerable portion of her time was employed in making extracts from the books she read, and in noting down her own thoughts and reflections in the way of a diary. She has left no less than six volumes of this kind, neatly written with her own hand, and chiefly after she became unable to move from her bed. She persevered in this practice until nearly the close of life, and till the hand could no longer guide the pen, as the last entry evidently shews:—it is a sentence unfinished. Nothing of this kind was seen during her life; but it is esteemed a valuable legacy by her surviving parents. A short extract from one of these volumes, containing the entry she made on her last birth-day, will shew how truly and cheerfully she was resigned to the will of God concerning her. It is as follows:—

"The revolving seasons have, through the good pleasure of my Almighty Lord, brought me to another of the anniversary returns of the day of my birth. Such is the will of God concerning me: and all He does is right. Blessed be his holy name, He, by his mighty power, maintains in my heart such a steadfast persuasion of this truth, that I find it sufficient to repress any thought which would arise in opposition to his will in this particular. And although I am certainly, as it relates to my body, 'a great sufferer,' (a term which I have hitherto objected to the use of, as inapplicable to my case)—a much greater one, than I ever supposed I should be—still my heart does justify the dealings of the Lord with his unworthy servant; and I do not only account them mercies, but I receive them as such at the hands of my heavenly Father. Nor is my belief in his tender love and pity at all weakened, but rather confirmed, by these strokes of his rod; for

my heart is made to feel, that it is *in love* that he corrects me, to refine and purify my soul. And not only this—but I see the effects which his chastisement towards me produces on the minds of some, who are witnesses of it, in leading them to acknowledge and recognise the ‘great power,’ the all-sufficient grace, and unchanging faithfulness of the Lord; who, in the substantial supports, and solid consolations, which he bestows upon his people in the needful time of trouble, manifests himself to be ‘the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.’

“Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name!” And O, forget not the chiefest of His benefits, in that he ‘forgiveth all thy sins!’ a far greater blessing, than the removal of any bodily infirmity, or the restoration of bodily health, which might be (as in former days it has been) perverted by my sinful heart, and might prove injurious rather than profitable to the best interests of my never-dying soul!”

There was one particular which the writer of this paper remarked in this pious and excellent character; namely, that she ever entertained a truly filial and reverential fear of God; and seemed impressed with peculiar solemnity of mind, whenever, in anticipation of her departure, she spoke of appearing in the presence of so infinitely holy a Being. But this solemn regard and veneration of God, were far from causing any gloom, or exciting a doubt in her mind, as to her future happiness. No: she knew “whom she had believed;” and she possessed and rejoiced in a “hope full of immortality:” and, when rendered by such thoughts

of God *most serious*, she would at the same time manifest a lively faith in the atoning merits and righteousness of Christ, “who,” (as she has said on such occasions with much emphasis) “is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.”

Perhaps few persons have had more earnest desires for holiness than the individual of whom I am writing. She was a fervent suppliant for larger measures of grace to purify and sanctify her heart: she truly “hungered and thirsted after righteousness:” she longed to be “made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light;” to “perfect holiness in the fear of God.” Her end was peaceful and happy.

These observations are not intended in the way of eulogy upon her character, however estimable; but as a brief memorial of a Christian, in whom was manifested, in a conspicuous manner, the power of the grace of God; and who, in her necessary seclusion from the world, and in much “weariness and painfulness,” afforded an example in many respects deserving of notice and imitation. She is now in possession of the end of her faith, and of her affliction, “the salvation of her soul;” “the far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory.” Having “washed her robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,” she is now “before the throne of God, serving him day and night in his temple.” May we also “be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises!”

Worcester,
March 23, 1818.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS.

F—X; AGRIPPA; S. Y.; *φιλομνος*; J.; SERIOUS; C. C.; A Paper on *Antinomianism*, without signature; and a *Memoir of W. F.*, by G. B.; have been received, and are under consideration.

E.’s papers are left at the Publisher’s, as desired; also those of THEOPHILUS.

H. is probably not aware that Manuscripts are invariably destroyed after insertion, as they can be of no further use.

The Annual Meeting of the British and Foreign Bible Society will be held at the Freemasons’ Hall, Great Queen Street, Lincoln’s Inn Fields, on Wednesday the 6th of May, when the President will take the chair at twelve o’clock precisely.